

Glenn F. Shortess, Traer.
Frederick W. Steele, Walker.
Boyd W. Smith, Waukon.

KENTUCKY

Walter Robins, Brodhead.
Henry I. Neely, Hazel.
Luther G. Bernard, Jamestown.
Quay C. Quigg, Livermore.
Mattie B. Griffin, Mount Vernon.
Robert H. Ledford, Paint Lick.
Albert R. Hornback, Sonora.

MARYLAND

John M. Reed, jr., Chesapeake City.
Herbert C. Leighton, Mountain Lake Park.
Frederick M. Gambrill, White Marsh.

MASSACHUSETTS

Harriett L. Green, East Brookfield.
Ursula G. Dehey, Hatfield.
Samuel F. Brown, Indian Orchard.
Delano E. Chase, Linwood.

MISSOURI

Kinzie K. Gittings, Chilhowee.
Vaughn Hammitt, Curryville.
Archie C. Witt, Gower.
Dwight A. Dawson, Lowry City.
John H. Fisher, Sullivan.

MONTANA

Harry D. Crandall, Bainville.
Pauline Polutnik, Belt.
Mary J. Tasa, Flaxville.
Blanche E. Breckenridge, Grassrange.
Francis P. Blair, Richey.

NEW JERSEY

Charles H. Conner, Bayonne.
George E. Obodyke, Landing.
Stephen H. Dayton, Mountain Lakes.
Edward W. Vanaman, Newfield.
Luther J. Higinson, Oradell.
Olla Mehlenbeck, Raritan.
Harry J. Manning, South Plainfield.

NEW MEXICO

Elizabeth A. Gumm, Carrizozo.
Charles Neustadt, Grant.

NEW YORK

Harold F. Kimball, Ballston Lake.
George E. Rockwood, Bombay.
Walter Carr, Chappaqua.
Daphne M. Brehme, Greenlawn.
C. Homer Hook, Greenville.
Sara H. Scott, Hague.
George P. Baumer, Kendall.
Clinton D. Drumm, Malverne.
Theodore W. Cook, Montauk.
Chester J. Hinman, Palenville.
George M. Grant, Parkville.
James R. Rodman, Port Ewen.
Sutherland Lent, Sloatsburg.
Howard M. Brush, Smithtown Branch.

NORTH DAKOTA

Howard S. Powlison, Wheatland.

PENNSYLVANIA

Arthur A. Butz, Alburtis.
J. Russell Clayton, Bryn Athyn.
John R. Diemer, Catawissa.
John W. Aumiller, Eagles Mere.
William H. Dickinson, Factoryville.
Benton C. Myers, Fayetteville.
Harvey L. Sterner, Gardners.
David K. Mead, Glenfield.
Hattie C. Liston, Isabella.
Claire A. Bower, Mather.
Katherine A. White, Mildred.
Archibald E. Patterson, Orangeville.
Charles A. Graeff, Schuylkill Haven.
Emma A. Smith, Seelyville.
Harry F. Groff, Seven Valleys.
Harry P. Medland, Waymart.

RHODE ISLAND

Lloyd B. Langworthy, Ashaway.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Dewey Stephens, Dillon.
William B. Gross, Holly Hill.
Stephen E. Leverette, Iva.
Harris P. DuBose, Jefferson.
Louis Stackley, Kingstree.
Horace A. White, Simpsonville.

TENNESSEE

Charles L. Bitner, Chuckey.
Glenn C. Hodges, Cowan.
Thomas W. Thompson, Mount Juliet.

UTAH

Frank M. Shafer, Moab.

VIRGINIA

Edward A. Lindsey, Boyce.
Mary F. Cunningham, Fort Myer.
Ruth E. Orrison, Hamilton.
Lilly G. Cook, Madison.
Robert E. Newman, Manassas.
James W. Moore, Rapidan.
Mandly K. Payne, Remington.
James R. Miller, Strasburg.

WASHINGTON

Fanny I. Jennings, Spangle.

WISCONSIN

Orrin W. Groot, Elmwood.
Victor F. Platta, Hatley.
Halvor Thorson, Hawkins.
Frank E. Munroe, Ladysmith.
John Lindow, Manawa.
Carl E. Reichenbach, Merrillan.
Milton R. Stanley, Shawano.
John H. Zahrt, Sparta.
Ernest L. Messer, Unity.
John E. Himley, Wabeno.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, April 22, 1930

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who dost lift us out of our mistakes and dost bear us beyond the blots and stains of wrongdoing, hear our prayer. O hear us! Again we are safely folded in the divine arms from whose embrace no peril can permanently separate us; we thank Thee. We are so grateful that we live in a world that is full of God. Thy wisdom, glory, and splendor are nearer than we think. May we feel their wonder. The lights and the shades, the murmurs and the silences, these all are voices that come and go at Thy call. O what a surplus of God everywhere. With such a God, who is our Father forevermore, let us be content to fulfill the divine ends of our beings in Thy good time and way. Again we ask Thee to hear us. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following date the President approved and signed a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

April 21, 1930:

H. J. Res. 171. Joint resolution providing for the observance and commemoration of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of the Monongahela, and establishing a commission to be known as the United States Battle of the Monongahela Commission.

VETO MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT—COINAGE OF SILVER 50-CENT PIECES IN COMMEMORATION OF SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GADSDEN PURCHASE

The SPEAKER. The business before the House is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill H. R. 2029, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask recognition for an hour, and I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. BLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes.

Mr. BLAND. Does not the gentleman think that on an important matter of this kind there should be a quorum present to hear the discussion? A quorum is going to vote on the measure.

Mr. PERKINS. Any Member of the House has the right to demand a quorum.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 23]

Auf der Heide	Finley	Leech	Shreve
Beedy	Gambrill	Linthicum	Sinclair
Black	Garrett	McClintock, Okla.	Sirovich
Blackburn	Gifford	McDuffie	Sloan
Britten	Griffin	McKeown	Smith, Idaho
Brunner	Hammer	McMillan	Smith, W. Va.
Carley	Hartley	Mead	Snow
Celler	Hopkins	Montague	Spearing
Chase	Hudspeth	Nelson, Wis.	Steagall
Chindblom	Hull, Wis.	Norhall	Stedman
Clark, Md.	Igoe	Norton	Stevenson
Cooke	James	O'Connell, R. I.	Sullivan, Pa.
Cramton	Jeffers	Owen	Swanson
Cross	Johnson, Ill.	Palmisano	Taylor, Colo.
Crowther	Johnson, Tex.	Quayle	Tucker
Curry	Kading	Rainey, Henry T.	Underwood
Davis	Kemp	Rowbottom	White
Dempsey	Kennedy	Sabath	Whitehead
Dickinson	Kerr	Sandlin	Whitley
Doughton	Kunz	Schafer, Wis.	Wurzbach
Drewry	Kvale	Short, Mo.	Wyant

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and forty-three Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the bill (H. R. 2029) introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUDSPETH] is a bill for the issue of ten thousand 50-cent memorial coins for the purpose of commemorating the settlement of the differences between the United States of America and the Republic of Mexico by the purchase known as the Gadsden purchase.

On the 4th of July of this year the seventy-fifth anniversary of that event will take place at El Paso, Tex., and other places along the border between the Republics.

There are two ways of looking at these coinage bills. One is that events of great national or international importance are very properly commemorated by the coinage of coins, and their sale—usually at a premium—in the particular sections interested in the coins. There have been before Congress in the last 10 years at least 15 different coinage bills. At the present time there are five bills of a similar nature pending. Inasmuch as H. R. 2029 has been vetoed by the President, it seemed proper that we have an expression of the House as to whether or not we should continue to report out of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures bills of this character.

The Treasury Department has a consistent policy against issuing commemorative coins. The position taken is that we ought not to interfere with our regular coinage for the purpose of commemorating some particular or special event; that such coinage is easily subject to being misused and counterfeited, and that all together it is something that out not to be done. The testimony before the committee is that, so far as any witness had knowledge, no coin issued for commemorative purposes has ever been counterfeited.

The other side is this, but our coinage ought to be regular; it ought not to be changed on varying occasions and that there ought to be a consistent and definite policy which the Treasury Department can follow.

The Secretary of the Treasury has written a letter to the chairman of the committee which explains the Treasury position fully. The letter contains a statement showing the coins that have been authorized heretofore and the probable return to the mint. I will ask that the letter be read in my time.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will read the letter.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 31, 1930.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have for acknowledgement your letter of January 29, transmitting a copy of H. R. 2029, a bill introduced by Mr. HUDSPETH, of Texas, to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in com-

memoration of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Gadsden purchase, and asking for an expression of the views of this department on this proposed legislation.

In responding to your request for a report on this bill I feel that the department can do no better than to restate its position in regard to special coins. Objection is made for the following reasons: Since 1920 15 acts of Congress have been passed, authorizing the issue of special coins. By the authorization of the issue of these 15 special coins within 10 years, Congress has permitted a new design for the half dollar at an average of one every eight months.

Section 3510 of the Revised Statutes provides that " * * * no change in the design or die of any coin shall be made oftener than once in twenty-five years from and including the first adoption of the design, model, die, or hub for the same coin * * *." The department considers that this enactment of Congress enunciated a wise general public policy, adopted after due deliberation.

Upon practically every occasion when the department has been invited to express an opinion upon special coin issues it has recommended disapproval of the passage of the bills. Upon a vigorous appeal before the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, when the bill was pending for the issue of the Bennington coin, the committee agreed to co-operate with the department in discouraging the issue of special coins. The committee went on record at that time in its report in the following terms:

"The committee desires at this time to go on record as not favoring legislation of this class because of the great number of bills introduced to commemorate events of local and not national interests, and because such quantities of the coins so authorized have had to be taken back by the Government, melted, and reminted."

Aside from the very dangerous and objectionable policy of diverting coinage from its original use in trade, we are imposing upon the mints, and therefore upon the Government, an unnecessary and wasteful practice. We are required to invest money in metal for unnecessary coinage, and we are entirely defeating the original idea that coinage should be on Government account only. We are imposing an unnecessary burden on the manufacturing plants charged with the preparation of coinage needed in business and are diverting the activities of the mints, intended to supply the needs of all of the people, in order to meet the demands of a few of the people. The department is now endeavoring to meet the coinage requirements of the country with the same number of mints that we had 30 years ago. This can only be done by avoiding every unnecessary undertaking and confining the work of the mints to the legitimate demands of the enormous business of the country for regular coinage.

For your confidential information I am appending a table which indicates the number of special coins authorized, coined, and then returned to the mints to be destroyed.

	Authorized	Coined	Returned to the mints
Columbian Exposition.....	5,000,000	5,000,000	2,501,700
Lewis and Clark.....	250,000	60,000	40,003
Panama-Pacific.....	200,000	60,000	32,866
McKinley Memorial.....	100,000	30,000	10,023
Landing of Pilgrims.....	300,000	300,000	80,000
Missouri Centennial.....	250,000	50,000	29,600
Grant Memorial.....	250,000	100,000	28,400
Huguenot-Walloon.....	300,000	142,000	55,000
California seventy-fifth anniversary.....	300,000	150,000	63,606
Battle of Bennington.....	40,000	40,000	11,892
Fort Vancouver Centennial.....	300,000	50,000	35,000
Sesquicentennial.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	420,000
Stone Mountain.....	5,000,000	2,134,000	(?)

¹ 55,000 Huguenot coins placed in circulation at face value.

² It is understood that large numbers of Stone Mountain coins are on hand, unsold, at the banks.

I have gone into this subject at some length in the hope that you will consent to assist us by intercepting the passage of further legislation of this character.

Very truly yours,

A. W. MELLON,
Secretary of the Treasury.

HON. RANDOLPH PERKINS,
Chairman, Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Mr. PERKINS. Our colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUDSPETH], sent his check to cover the entire amount of the coinage provided for in this particular bill, and to include also the cost to the Treasury of minting the coins, so that in this case there can be no possible loss to the Treasury.

The matter has another aspect. There are now pending five bills for the coinage of commemorative coins. Our colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FITZGERALD], has introduced a bill to commemorate the surrender of Cornwallis by a 50-cent coin. After the introduction of the bill Mr. FITZGERALD wrote a letter to the Treasury Department requesting information as

to the cost of minting, and seeking other information, the answer to which letter I will read:

MARCH 18, 1930.

Hon. ROY G. FITZGERALD,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FITZGERALD: I have for acknowledgment your letter of March 8th relative to the proposed issue of 50-cent pieces for the sesquicentennial of the surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown.

The cost of manufacturing 200,000 commemorative half dollars would be as follows:

Coinage charges	\$1,500.00
Silver, at the March 15, 1930, market rate of 41 cents per fine ounce	29,660.00
Copper for alloy, at the current market price of 18 cents per avoirdupois pound	99.36

If the department can serve you further, please do not hesitate to call upon us.

Respectfully,

A. W. MELLON,
Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. FITZGERALD has figured that if these 200,000 coins be actually issued and remained in circulation the profit to the Treasury would be something like \$68,740.64, due to the difference in the cost of the silver in the coins and the value at which the Treasury put the coins out.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. BLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes.

Mr. BLAND. I want to ask the gentleman if I understand that if the Treasury Department coined the 200,000 50-cent pieces under the bill authorizing the coinage of those commemorative coins there would be a profit to the Treasury of \$68,000? Was that the statement made by the gentleman?

Mr. PERKINS. There would be that profit if the coins remained in the possession of the public, but if the coins went back to the Treasury Department there would not be that profit.

Mr. BLAND. Is it not a fact that in every bill that is now being reported from the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures there is a provision that those coins shall be taken from the Treasury Department and that no part shall go back to the Treasury?

Mr. PERKINS. That is largely true. The committee has required the proponents of the bills to furnish a guarantee by way of a bank guarantee, or otherwise, that all the coins would be taken, but, of course, there is no method by which we can prevent the coins from eventually getting back to the Treasury.

Mr. BLAND. May I ask the gentleman one more question? Did I understand the gentleman to say that the evidence before his committee showed that these commemorative coins had never been counterfeited?

Mr. PERKINS. So far as the evidence went, it tended to show that there had never been any counterfeiting of a commemorative coin.

Mr. BLAND. Was not that statement made before the committee, and did not the Treasury fail to meet the statement?

Mr. PERKINS. The statement was made before the committee by a coin collector, but I can not say whether the Treasury met the statement or not.

Mrs. ROGERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the lady from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS. It is my recollection that the Assistant Director of the Mint, before your committee, stated twice in answer to that question that a special coin has never been counterfeited.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not true that about half of these coins have been returned to the Treasury?

Mr. PERKINS. It is true that the issuing of these coins has usually been a great disappointment to the proponents.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. And about half of them have been returned?

Mr. PERKINS. More than half have been returned.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time and yield one minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY].

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, apropos of the veterans' legislation which has been before the House for the past few days, I would like to call the attention of the Members to the fact that in the gallery to-day we have one of the finest officers who ever commanded

a combat division, Maj. Gen. Clarence R. Edwards, former commander of the Twenty-sixth (Yankee) Division. [Applause, the Members rising.]

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, as stated by the chairman of the committee, this bill is one introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUNSPETH] asking for legislation that the mint shall coin ten thousand 50-cent coins to commemorate the historic event known as the Gadsden purchase.

In the interest of this bill, owing to the fact that my colleague was not permitted to be present on account of sickness, I appeared before the committee, and when the representative of the Treasury Department made the statement that one objection to the issuance of these coins was the fact that it would encourage counterfeiting, I asked him the direct question if he had an instance on record where one of these coins had been counterfeited. He said that he had not.

In reading the President's message giving his reasons for vetoing this bill, I wish to call your attention especially to the statement—

During the past 10 years 15 such special acts providing for minting commemorative coins have been passed, an average of one each eight months, an aggregate of over 13,000,000 such coins having been minted.

The President evidently meant that authority had been given for the issuance of such coins, for the record shows that approximately a little over 7,000,000 coins have actually been minted. Of this number, 2,000,000 and some have been returned unused to the mint.

It occurs to me that while the Government is not at any expense, while the record shows there never has been any counterfeiting of a commemorative coin, Congress has the record for a number of years of recognizing similar historic events all over this great land of ours; and with a guaranty that the Government shall not be out any money on the coinage of these silver pieces, and as the record shows from the statement of the chairman relative to the letter of the Treasury to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FITZGERALD], on these 10,000 coins that we are asking the Government to coin for us the Government will make, owing to the low price of silver, \$340 a thousand, or \$3,400 net.

As stated by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PERKINS] the authorities have a check from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUNSPETH] guaranteeing the Government against loss, and while my check may not be worth anything, I will give you one and have it certified, guaranteeing that not one of these 50-cent pieces will be returned to the Treasury; and if any should be returned, I will give \$1 apiece for them. [Applause.]

* Think about the great domain in the southwestern part of the country that is larger than the thirteen original States—Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, most of Utah, and California—asking for recognition of an historic event, if you please, by the Government giving us the right to commemorate this event.

The celebration will be an international affair. The President of Mexico has already agreed to visit Villetros and El Paso on this date. Efforts are being made to have the President of the United States there. The Governors of Texas, New Mexico, and Arizona, and other States will be present.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Ordinarily, I agree with the Executive of this Government in many of his vetoes, but here is a measure where the Government is guaranteed against loss. The facts are the Government will make between \$3,400 and \$3,500. Of course, this is not much to the Government, but it is better to be on the credit side than the debit side, and we surely need more funds on the credit side.

I may say, with respect to some of the other measures that the President and Mr. Mellon have referred to, that those coins were issued without any guaranty to the Government that there would not be a loss, and the result was that the Government sustained a loss; but this is not that kind of a case.

The Government is guaranteed against loss in every way, and as I have said, when you realize the great domain of the Southwest—Texas, Arizona, and New Mexico—commemorating the greatest historic event in that part of the country, I can not understand why this House on this bill would not override the President's veto. I thank you. [Applause.]

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DOUGLASS].

Mr. DOUGLASS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I speak primarily as a member of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures that has jurisdiction over such matters as are covered in this bill. I will take as my text in the brief time allotted to me that portion of the veto message which reads as follows:

There are a great many historical events which it is not only highly proper but desirable to commemorate in a suitable way, but the longer use of our coins for this purpose is unsuitable and unwise.

I take it, as has been so eloquently expressed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILLIAMS] that the Gadsden purchase is an event of the greatest historical significance in the United States, and is, therefore, "a great historical event," in the language of the President—

Which it is not only highly proper but desirable to commemorate in a suitable way.

Reference has been made to the fact that there are other bills for coins to commemorate great historical events which have been passed by this committee, and one of them is the Massachusetts tercentennial bill, so-called, to provide for the issuance of 500,000 fifty-cent silver pieces to commemorate the landing of the Puritans and the establishment of representative government in America.

I say nothing of the great events in other parts of the country, but that certainly, the landing of the Puritans, 300 years ago, on these shores, is to quote the language of the President—

An historical event which it is highly proper and desirable to commemorate in a suitable way.

We can commemorate events of that kind in many suitable ways.

The Gadsden Purchase coin will arouse the interest of people of the Southwest. In commemoration of the landing of the Puritans in Massachusetts, people will gather from all over the country to commemorate the establishment of free government in this country.

Is it any too much to ask that when we celebrate such movements that we should ask this little fragment of assistance from the Treasury of the United States?

President McKinley said—

That the memory of heroes is the nurse of patriotism.

To commemorate heroes and historical events is to keep alive the spirit of patriotism in this country. The Treasury of the United States can cooperate to that end.

As to this particular bill, the arguments against it made before the committee and rehearsed in the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury, and in the memorandum of the veto message of the President, were fairly and completely heard. It was absolutely shown before the committee that never in the history of all of our coinage had there been a counterfeit of a memorial coin.

What is a memorial coin for? Where the State can not afford it and the Government is unwilling to afford assistance for a great national celebration, this kind of legislation affords the means for the issuance of coinage of 50-cent pieces to be sold for \$1, so that the people will get the benefit of the increased sale, and by that means the Government places its approval on the public celebration.

Gentlemen, we can safely pass this legislation.

If we do not pass the bill to-day, meritorious as it is, we are going to accomplish what the President evidently desires in the second part of his message, which I read:

But the longer use of our coins for this purpose is unsuitable and unwise.

The issue to-day is whether that is so or not. [Applause.]

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND].

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, there are other bills which have been reported to the House. They are the bills commemorating the Lewis and Clark expedition, and the Massachusetts bill. In fact, the Massachusetts bill has passed the House. There is also the Yorktown bill, which the Yorktown Sesquicentennial Commission, consisting of five Senators and five Members of the House, has recommended. That measure was introduced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FITZGERALD], and provides for the coinage of 500,000 fifty-cent silver pieces to commemorate the surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown. It strikes me as exceedingly remarkable that the veto message of the President says that these coins have no particular value as commemorative coins, and then in the same message expresses the fear that there will be counterfeiting of these coins.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Whose bill was this originally?

Mr. BLAND. This bill now before the House is the bill of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUDSPETH]. The point has been made and stressed that there has been no counterfeiting of these coins. Therefore, the objection made by the Treasury Department and by the President that there is danger of counterfeiting is answered by the cold, bald fact, that there has been no counterfeiting of these coins. The second objection is the burden that it places upon the Treasury. That point is answered by the information which was given to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FITZGERALD] that at the present price of silver, the Treasury, on 200,000 fifty-cent pieces, would be making a profit of \$68,000. I think the Treasury might well assume the burden for the profit of \$68,000 which will be made out of this coinage. This objection is also met by the guarantee that these coins will not come back into the Treasury. Then the point is made by the President in his message—and the President's message is nothing but a reiteration of the position taken by Mr. Mellon before the committee of the House—that there is an additional burden imposed upon the mints of the United States.

It strikes me, my countrymen, that the mints of the United States may bear the additional burden for the coinage of commemorative coins for the people of our own country, when we have here the uncontradicted letter from a coin collector written on March 5, 1930, that our mints are of sufficient capacity to do coinage for Poland and Central and South American countries. During January we coined 2,000,000 bronze coins for Costa Rica and 40,000 for Nicaragua. Last year we coined 9,200,000 coins for Venezuela and 21,640,000 for Ecuador, and 1,500,000 for Panama. If there is an additional burden on the mints, let the mints bear it for the citizens of our own country and not for those of foreign countries as is shown by this letter. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, if there were anything in the message of the President that added anything new to the matter that has been before the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, I should not have the temerity to take the floor on this occasion, but that committee, as patriotic, as devoted, as loyal as the Secretary of the Treasury, has the right to submit legislation for this House, and the Congress has the right to determine the policies of this country. The Congress is as much interested in the protection of the money of this country as is the Secretary of the Treasury, or, even the President of the United States. So I ask this House to pass this bill over the veto of the President. [Applause.]

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, my sole interest in this matter is because I have been appointed by the Speaker of this House as a member of the United States Yorktown Sesquicentennial Commission. At the request of the commission I introduced a bill for the coinage of 50-cent pieces commemorating the end of the Revolutionary War, the surrender of the British forces under Cornwallis at Yorktown. I took it up as a business measure. I knew that there had been reluctance on the part of the United States Treasury for many years to enter into these enterprises because they are beneath the dignity of the Treasury Department, which simply wants to coin money which will circulate freely and not serve any sentimental purpose. And I admire that type of man. It has a place in our political system and our economic system. But when I came to investigate the matter I find that only a few years ago silver cost \$1.36 an ounce. I knew that silver had fallen to 40½ cents. But when I wrote to the Treasury for the figures I found they are paying 41 cents an ounce for fine silver. When they started this policy some years ago silver cost something. They apprehended that the commemorative coins might be counterfeited. They have clung to that policy of opposition and have given the same reasons over and over again. Experience shows that there never has been any counterfeiting of these coins. They are treasured in the homes of patriotic people in the United States, in the collections of numismatists, and they are not in general circulation. The mere fact that the Government by its mere stamp permits the coin to be legal tender at 50 cents is no indication that anyone will ever get one for 50 cents.

I knew that some of the coins have been returned to the mint for recoinage in years past, and so I asked the Secretary of the Treasury for a statement, and I shall put in the RECORD a complete statement of the coins issued and the number authorized and the number returned to the mint.

Those that are returned to the mint cost the Government little or nothing. They are made of fine silver of the standard required for our metallic money, and the expense of melting is insignificant. But when I asked the Secretary of the Treasury for the profit that would come to the United States Government itself by simply putting out these coins at par to the commission he gave me the figures that have already been inserted in the RECORD by my friend from New Jersey [Mr. PERKINS], showing that on 200,000 of these coins the Government would make a profit of \$68,740. If the full 500,000 are minted and disposed of, the profit to the Government would be over \$170,000. The commission has reason to believe that all could be sold, for the banks at Richmond, Va., have undertaken to form a committee for that purpose. If they could be so marketed, there would not only be the \$170,000 of profit to the Government but there would be a fund produced of over \$200,000 for the United States commission to carry out the duty with which you have charged it.

I have been over the ground at Yorktown. I know the great amount of work and the great expense that will be entailed if we invite the French and British to participate in the celebration in October of next year as they did at the centennial in 1881. I hope that we might get some contribution from those patriotic people who would gladly buy these coins to help pay the expense. When I find that the Government would make over \$68,000 profit on 200,000 of these coins, I could see nothing to stand in the way either from a business or a sentimental standpoint. The President of the United States has been misinformed on this subject when he was advised that the mints would be overworked by the coinage of 10,000 coins in commemoration of the Gadsden purchase. I want you to know what the mints have been doing for foreign governments.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, may I have a little more time?

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how many minutes I have remaining?

The SPEAKER. Eighteen.

Mr. PERKINS. I yield one minute more to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FITZGERALD. To show what the mints have been doing for other countries I may mention these figures: For Siam, 10,000,000 coins in a year; for Peru, 20,000,000 coins in a year; for Cuba, 27,000,000 coins; for Indo-China, 27,000,000 coins; for Colombia, 24,000,000 coins.

Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to extend my remarks and insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the whole record as to what we are doing for foreign countries. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. These memorial coins are the symbols of patriotic remembrance and appreciation of the outstanding events of the history of our country. They will endure when our monuments of granite and bronze have turned to dust. To-day we have the coins of Alexander the Great and Julius Caesar cherished in our museums and in a multitude of private collections. There is nothing more imperishable, more lasting, or more calculated to serve as a commemorative token.

When the Treasury Department objects to the trifling labor involved in minting 10,000 coins to commemorate the Gadsden purchase or 500,000 to register our appreciation of the end of the War of the Revolution, it not only shows a callous disregard for the loyal sentiments of our people but a disregard of the material welfare of the Government. To claim that the mints are overtaxed, or likely to be by the striking of these coins, arouses suspicion in the face of the report that our mints have manufactured in the last 11 years more than 300,000,000 coins for foreign countries, as set forth in the following table:

Foreign coinages executed at the United States mints

Country:	1919	Number of pieces
Siam	10,000,000	
Salvador	3,000,000	
Nicaragua	850,000	
Venezuela	3,200,000	
Peru	20,750,000	
1920		
Cuba	37,548,000	
Salvador	3,492,000	
Peru	4,544,000	
Nicaragua	850,000	
Colombia	11,395,000	
Indo-China	27,290,000	
Argentina	11,383,334	

Country:	1921	Number of pieces
Costa Rica	3,000	
Cuba	1,590,352	
Colombia	24,005,000	
Venezuela	3,100,000	
Peru	15,456,000	
Indo-China	6,560,000	
Salvador	3,780,000	
1922		
Costa Rica	13,030	
Colombia	3,000,000	
Venezuela	2,800,000	
Nicaragua	900,000	
Indo-China	1,150,000	
1923		
Peru	4,369,000	
1924		
Poland	4,400,000	
Peru	3,113,196	
Venezuela	4,450,000	
Nicaragua	700,000	
1925		
Guatemala	1,570,000	
Poland	1,600,000	
Peru	1,291,000	
Venezuela	2,800,000	
Salvador	6,200,000	
1926		
Costa Rica	15,000	
Guatemala	115,000	
Venezuela	2,800,000	
Peru	11,657,000	
Salvador	400,000	
1927		
Nicaragua	850,000	
Venezuela	2,800,000	
1928		
Nicaragua	1,800,000	
Ecuador	9,878,000	
Costa Rica	25,000	
Salvador	5,000,000	
1929		
Venezuela	9,200,000	
Nicaragua	640,000	
Ecuador	21,640,000	
Costa Rica	2,000,000	
Panama	1,500,000	
Total	300,070,912	

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, this legislation had my support in the committee, and I shall vote for it to-day, the veto of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

If I felt that in this bill there was danger of injury to the coinage system of our country, of course I should support the President in his veto. But inasmuch as these commemorative coins have never been counterfeited, I wonder if it would not be well to have all our coins commemorative. This bill will not cost the Government anything. Possibly it will put a little more work on somebody in the Treasury Department, but we have no evidence that these employees are not able to perform this extra duty.

The minting of this coin would give encouragement to a section of the country, which, in my opinion, is deserving of as much recognition as any part of our entire Nation.

My history tells me that less than 100 years ago, on April 21, 1836, I believe, Sam Houston, with a band of brave persons who were native Texans, at the Battle of San Jacinto defeated the Mexican forces under Santa Anna and set up a state of their own, and the sons of those same men are now asking the Congress of the United States to permit them to purchase with a check here in hand \$10,000 worth of coins to give honor and commemoration to the Gadsden purchase. Yes; their forefathers set up an independent nation of Texas, won with sword their independence, and then entered our Union of States as a brave, powerful, and patriotic member. Later Arizona and New Mexico came into the Union.

My friends, that is the way sons of Texas, Arizona, and New Mexico do things—open and whole-hearted, aboveboard, and unafraid. They do not ask the Government to lose a cent, but they say, "Here is the money for the coins and the cost of minting thereof." During my five years of service on the Coinage Committee I do not recall another instance where they have said, "Here is the money. All we want you to do is to lend us the moral assistance of our Government." To me, my friends, "word" of my Texas colleagues, Mr. HUDSPETH and Mr. WILLIAMS, was entirely sufficient; it was unnecessary for them to offer further guarantee that the cost of the coins would be met.

The great Southwest is anxious for the passage of the bill. These sturdy citizens of the great open spaces have written rich pages in the history of our Nation. They are strong in their patriotism and firm in causes for the common good of the country. I shall vote for the passage of the bill and thus give my approval to their commemorative efforts. [Applause.]

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SIMMS].

Mr. SIMMS. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, I can understand full well why the distinguished head of the Treasury Department could have a fastidious dislike for such a bill. He is constantly occupied with the management of the most important branch of the Government's activities, and I know that one who has concentrated on the one subject of finance would quite likely lose sight of any sentimental value that might be attached to the passage of such a bill.

You may remember that the issue asked for in this bill is quite small, 10,000 coins, of the value of \$5,000. It is not important in the life of the country but it is important to the region which I have the honor to represent, the State of New Mexico.

Please remember that this bill has been used as a stalking horse; that it is a typical bill; that the fate of this bill will be the fate of the Massachusetts Bay bill, the fate of the Yorktown bill, the fate of the Oregon purchase bill, and others. After all, why should there not be a little sentiment in Government? There ought to be other things beside the fact that two and two make four. It occurs to me that one of the most valuable thoughts to be considered about the advisability of the passage of this bill is that it will promote our international relations with the Republic of Mexico. On the occasion of this celebration, which is to be July 5, there will be friendly groups from both Republics, and we all know that the more people exchange ideas with each other the less likely they are to have prejudices and the more likely they are to have their sentiments grow into lasting feelings of friendship. It occurs to me it would be greatly in the public interest to pass this bill, and I ask the House to pass it without the aid of the White House. [Applause.]

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LOZIER].

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Speaker, I favor the enactment of this legislation, notwithstanding the Presidential veto. By this measure it is proposed to mint 10,000 half-dollar coins to commemorate the so-called Gadsden purchase. In July a celebration is to be held in El Paso, Tex., to commemorate this historic event which added 45,535 square miles of territory to our national domain. This is a celebration in which all of the people of the great Southwest are interested. It has been the custom in the past for the Government to issue coins on occasions of this character, however without expense to the Government. In the past, commemorative coins have been authorized and issued for the following expositions: Columbian, Louisiana Purchase, Lewis & Clark, Panama-Pacific, and Sesquicentennial; also for the Missouri and Fort Vancouver Centennials, the Stone Mountain, Grant, McKinley, and Huguenot-Walloon Memorials, and the Battle of Bennington and Landing of the Pilgrims celebrations.

Those behind this movement to celebrate the Gadsden purchase have offered to take these coins as soon as they are minted, and pay the Government their full value. I understand that a certified check has been deposited, or is available to insure the payment to the Government of the full value of these coins. While the Government will get 100 cents on the dollar for these coins, those in charge of this celebration will be able to sell them at a premium. In this way, the celebration will be promoted without expense to the Government, and these coins will be kept as mementoes of this celebration, and of the purchase it commemorates.

Moreover, the coining of these pieces will mean a net profit to the Government of about \$3,400, because the silver in the coins will not cost the Government anything like the amount it receives for the coins. So from a business standpoint this is a good proposition for the Government.

The President suggests that these memorial coins might be counterfeited; but the evidence shows there has never been a single case where any of the coins of this kind were counterfeited. This is established by the testimony of Secretary Mellon, so that objection on the part of the President falls to the ground. There is no more danger of these special coins being counterfeited than there is of the other coins issued by the Government being counterfeited.

I can not believe that this measure was carefully considered by the President. I am convinced that if President Hoover had made an independent investigation of this matter he never would have written this veto message. It is quite evident that he has been imposed upon by Secretary Mellon, because in this

veto message he follows very closely the statements made by Mr. Mellon in his testimony before the committee. The message reflects a selfish and sordid note or sentiment. It condemns a sentiment that ought to be encouraged in America. I do not think we should let the oncoming generations forget the wonderful achievements of those who built, developed, and expanded our mighty Nation.

I favor this bill because it will stimulate patriotism and inspire a feeling of pride for our many accomplishments as a nation, and while this project will not cost the Government a penny, if it cost \$5,000 the money would be well expended in the stimulation of patriotism. I think we give too little thought to the spiritual things of life and are becoming a selfish and sordid nation. More and more we are measuring everything by the standard of the dollar. We are neglecting the higher, nobler, and better things of life, disregarding the high ideals that should actuate a republic such as ours, and we are measuring everything by the dollar, which is rapidly becoming the rule or yardstick for everything we are asked to do. These coins will be handed down from father to son, and will inspire patriotism, better citizenship, and interest in public affairs. In coming generations these coins will be prized and exhibited as memorials of outstanding historic events.

It is fitting that the Gadsden purchase be commemorated. It was an important event in the history of the great Southwest. Our war with Mexico was ended in 1848 by the treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo. This treaty indefinitely defined the boundaries between the United States and Mexico. Both nations claimed the territory bounded on the north by the Gila River and on the east by the Rio Grande. Under this treaty the United States agreed to protect Mexico from depredations in Mexico by Indians living on our side of the international boundary line. This we failed to do, and Mexico presented claims against our Government amounting to between \$20,000,000 and \$30,000,000.

The territory to which I have referred was claimed by our Territory of New Mexico and also by the State of Chihuahua, in Mexico, which controversy threatened no end of trouble, and possibly war. In order to adjust this conflict and to acquire this additional territory, James Gadsden, our minister to Mexico, acting under instructions from our Government, negotiated a treaty during the closing days of 1853, which was ratified in 1854, and by which treaty a district containing over 45,000 square miles of territory along the southern sides of Arizona and New Mexico was ceded by Mexico to the United States, in consideration of which we paid Mexico \$10,000,000 and Mexico canceled her claims against the United States growing out of depredations of American Indians in Mexican territory.

It has been claimed that in the acquisition of this territory far-seeing Americans looked forward to the time when it would furnish a route for what is now the Southern Pacific Railroad through Arizona and New Mexico, with much lower grades than would have been required had the road been projected over a route through the more mountainous territory farther north which was conceded to belong to the United States.

The people of Mexico were very much opposed to ceding this land to the United States, and largely because of the transaction the Mexican President, General Santa Anna, was banished from his office and country. But no American has ever questioned the wisdom of our Government in having made the so-called Gadsden purchase, and the people of Texas are to be congratulated on their coming celebration of this important historic event. What this bill asks our Government to do costs the Government nothing, gives it a profit of \$3,400, and encourages a commendable and patriotic enterprise. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON].

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, the fundamental question before us is whether this is a proper use of the coinage, or whether it is not; in fact, an abuse of the coinage. It is true we have entered upon this policy, and for a number of years we have reported out and passed certain of these bills, one after another, on some of the same excuses that have been presented in this case. After all, what is the purpose of the coinage? Is it to issue medals to celebrate historical occasions? No. The fundamental purpose of our coinage is to furnish a proper circulating medium for our people.

I believe in celebrating historical occasions, and there is a proper way to do it; but how much does it add to the dignity of the celebration to issue a half dollar purporting to commemorate that occasion?

There are other ways and proper ways to celebrate historical anniversaries. If we wish to authorize a medal, all right; but

let us not go on with this policy of really abusing our coinage by the issuance of one after another of these memorial coins.

As I understand, there are now five more bills of the same kind to follow this one; and if these pass there will be numerous other occasions to be commemorated in the same way. Our country's life has been so full of historical events that we might celebrate many of them every year, and where would it end, so far as our coinage is concerned? It seems to me that we have reached a place where we ought to consider this question calmly and dispassionately, and if we do I think we shall make up our minds that the time has come to cease using our coinage for such a purpose. We know in our hearts this is not the proper way to celebrate these events. We know that in this case the President is right in asking that this method of celebrating historical events should stop.

Being right—and, in my judgment, most of us believe that he is right—we should, of course, support him. I believe that each one of us upon calm and judicial reflection will conclude that he is warranted in asking us to stop what amounts to an abuse of the public coinage. I sincerely hope that this House will take this calm view of it, and because the President is right and because we know he is right, support him. [Applause.]

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question. The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ACKERMAN). The question now is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, H. R. 2029, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding? Under the Constitution the vote is taken by the yeas and nays, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 96, nays 244, answered "present" 2, not voting 86, as follows:

[Roll No. 24]

YEAS—96

Abernethy	Douglas, Ariz.	Hill, Wash.	Patman
Allgood	Douglass, Mass.	Howard	Patterson
Almon	Doxey	Hull, Tenn.	Pou
Bankhead	Drane	Jeffers	Prall
Bell	Driver	Jones, Tex.	Ragon
Bland	Edwards	Lampert	Ramspeck
Bloom	Eslick	Lanham	Rankin
Box	Esterly	Lankford, Ga.	Rayburn
Boylan	Evans, Mont.	Larsen	Romjue
Brand, Ga.	Fisher	Lindsay	Rutherford
Briggs	Fitzgerald	Lozier	Sanders, Tex.
Browning	Fitzpatrick	Ludlow	Simms
Buchanan	Fuller	McCormack, Mass.	Speaks
Busby	Fulmer	McDuffie	Sullivan, N. Y.
Canfield	Garner	McKeynolds	Summers, Tex.
Cartwright	Gasque	McSwain	Tarver
Clark, N. C.	Gavagan	Mansfield	Vinson, Ga.
Collier	Glover	Montet	Warren
Connery	Goldsborough	Moore, Ky.	Williams
Cooper, Tenn.	Green	Moore, Va.	Wilson
Cox	Gregory	O'Connor, La.	Wingo
Crisp	Hare	Oldfield	Woodrum
Cullen	Hastings	Oliver, Ala.	Wright
Dominick	Hill, Ala.	Parks	Yon

NAYS—244

Ackerman	Colton	Hale	LaGuardia
Adkins	Connolly	Hall, Ill.	Langley
Aldrich	Cooke	Hall, Ind.	Lankford, Va.
Allen	Cooper, Ohio	Hall, Miss.	Lea
Andresen	Cooper, Wis.	Hall, N. Dak.	Leavitt
Andrew	Coyle	Halsey	Lehlbach
Arentz	Craddock	Hancock	Letts
Arnold	Crail	Haugen	Luce
Ayres	Crosser	Hawley	McClintock, Ohio
Bacharach	Culkin	Hess	McFadden
Bachmann	Dallinger	Hickey	McCormick, Ill.
Bacon	Darrow	Hoch	McLaughlin
Baird	Dempsey	Hogg	McLeod
Barbour	Denison	Holaday	Maas
Beck	De Priest	Hooper	Magrady
Beers	Dickstein	Hope	Manlove
Blackburn	Doutrich	Houston, Del.	Mapes
Bohn	Dowell	Huddleston	Martin
Bolton	Dunbar	Hull, Morton D.	Merritt
Bowman	Dyer	Hull, William E.	Michaelson
Brand, Ohio	Eaton, Colo.	Hull, Wis.	Michener
Brigham	Eaton, N. J.	Irwin	Miller
Browne	Elliott	Jenkins	Milligan
Brumm	Ellis	Johnson, Ind.	Montague
Buckbee	Englebright	Johnson, Nebr.	Mooney
Burdick	Estep	Johnson, S. Dak.	Moore, Ohio
Burtness	Evans, Calif.	Johnson, Wash.	Morehead
Butler	Fenn	Johnson, Mo.	Morgan
Byrns	Fish	Jonas, N. C.	Mouser
Campbell, Iowa	Fort	Kahn	Murphy
Cannon	Foss	Kearns	Nelson, Me.
Carter, Calif.	Frear	Kelly	Nelson, Mo.
Carter, Wyo.	Free	Kemp	Niedringhaus
Chalmers	French	Kendall, Ky.	Nolan
Christgau	Garber, Okla.	Kendall, Pa.	O'Connor, Okla.
Christopherson	Garber, Va.	Ketcham	Oliver, N. Y.
Clague	Gibson	Kiefner	Palmer
Clancy	Golder	Kiess	Parker
Clark, Md.	Goodwin	Kincheloe	Peavey
Clarke, N. Y.	Graham	Kinzer	Perkins
Cochran, Mo.	Granfield	Knutson	Pittenger
Cochran, Pa.	Greenwood	Kopp	Porter
Cole	Guyer	Kurtz	Pratt, Harcourt J.
Collins	Hadley	Kvale	Pratt, Ruth

Pritchard	Selvig	Swanson	Wainwright
Purnell	Shaffer, Va.	Swick	Walker
Quin	Shott, W. Va.	Swing	Wason
Ramey, Frank M.	Simmons	Taber	Watres
Ramsdayer	Sinclair	Taylor, Tenn.	Watson
Ransley	Snell	Temple	Welch, Calif.
Reece	Snow	Thatcher	Welsh, Pa.
Reed, N. Y.	Somers, N. Y.	Thompson	Whitley
Robinson	Sparks	Thurston	Whittington
Rogers	Sproul, Ill.	Tilson	Wigglesworth
Sabath	Stafford	Timberlake	Williamson
Sanders, N. Y.	Stalker	Tinkham	Wolfenden
Schafer, Wis.	Stobbs	Treadway	Wolverton, N. J.
Schneider	Stone	Turpin	Wolverton, W. Va.
Sears	Strong, Kans.	Underhill	Wood
Seeger	Strong, Pa.	Vestal	Woodruff
Seiberling	Summers, Wash.	Vincent, Mich.	Yates

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Aswell O'Connor, N. Y.

NOT VOTING—86

Auf der Heide	Drewry	Korell	Short, Mo.
Beedy	Finley	Kunz	Shreve
Black	Freeman	Lambertson	Sirovich
Britten	Gambrill	Leech	Sloan
Brunner	Garrett	Linthicum	Smith, Idaho
Cable	Gifford	McClintic, Okla.	Smith, W. Va.
Campbell, Pa.	Griffin	McKeown	Sparring
Carley	Hammer	McMillan	Sproul, Kans.
Celler	Hardy	Mead	Steagall
Chase	Hartley	Menges	Stedman
Chindblom	Hoffman	Nelson, Wis.	Stevenson
Corning	Hopkins	Newhall	Sullivan, Pa.
Cramton	Hudson	Norton	Taylor, Colo.
Cross	Hudspeth	O'Connell, N. Y.	Tucker
Crowther	Igoe	O'Connell, R. I.	Underwood
Curry	James	Owen	White
Davenport	Johnson, Ill.	Palmisano	Whitehead
Davis	Johnson, Okla.	Quayle	Wurzbach
DeRouen	Johnson, Tex.	Rainey, Henry T.	Wyant
Dickinson	Kading	Reid, Ill.	Zihlman
Doughton	Kennedy	Rowbottom	
Doyle	Kerr	Sandlin	

So, two-thirds having failed to vote in favor thereof, the bill was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Linthicum and Mr. Hudspeth (for) with Mr. Shreve (against).
 Mr. McKeown and Mr. McClintic of Oklahoma (for) with Mr. Reid of Illinois (against).
 Mr. Sandlin and Mr. Sparring (for) with Mr. Chindblom (against).
 Mr. Stedman and Mr. O'Connell of New York (for) with Mr. Beedy (against).
 Mr. Carley and Mr. Quayle (for) with Mr. Curry (against).
 Mr. McMillan and Mr. Celler (for) with Mr. Wyant (against).
 Mr. Doughton and Mr. Hammer (for) with Mr. Cramton (against).
 Mr. Smith of West Virginia and Mr. Cross (for) with Mr. Sullivan of Pennsylvania (against).
 Mr. Garrett and Mr. Johnson of Texas (for) with Mr. Short (against).
 Mr. Auf der Heide and Mr. Black (for) with Mr. Crowther (against).
 Mrs. Norton and Mr. Brunner (for) with Mr. Hopkins (against).
 Mr. DeRouen and Mr. Corning (for) with Mr. Hudson (against).
 Mr. Mead and Mrs. Owen (for) with Mr. Cable (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. Campbell of Pennsylvania with Mr. Davis.
 Mr. Smith of Idaho with Mr. Gambrill.
 Mr. Dickinson with Mr. Kunz.
 Mr. Gifford with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma.
 Mr. Johnson of Illinois with Mr. Igoe.
 Mr. Menges with Mr. Kerr.
 Mr. White with Mr. Steagall.
 Mr. Zihlman with Mr. Tucker.
 Mr. Wurzbach with Mr. O'Connell of Rhode Island.
 Mr. Britten with Mr. Doyle.
 Mr. Davenport with Mr. Kennedy.
 Mr. Freeman with Mr. Whitehead.
 Mr. James with Mr. Henry T. Rainey.
 Mr. Leech with Mr. Drewry.
 Mr. Newhall with Mr. Griffin.
 Mr. Hartley with Mr. Underwood.
 Mr. Rowbottom with Mr. Stevenson.
 Mr. Chase with Mr. Palmisano.
 Mr. Kading with Mr. Sirovich.
 Mr. Hardy with Mr. Taylor of Colorado.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the Clerk will inform the Senate of the action of the House, and without objection the Chair will refer the bill and the President's message back to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] I offer a privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 210

Resolved, That MARTIN J. KENNEDY, of New York, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committees of the House, as follows: Claims, Labor.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have five days from to-morrow in which to file minority views on H. R. 10668 and H. R. 10670.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that he may have five legislative days in which to file minority views on House bill 10669 and 10670. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes in order to make a statement with reference to the Rivers and Harbors bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Mr. Speaker, the waterways of the Nation have for many years been of little service except along the seaboard and the Great Lakes system. The reason has been that our railroad transportation was so efficient and so cheap that it was unnecessary to consider waterways.

However, since the war, railroad costs have gone up by leaps and bounds. This is not a reflection upon the management of the railroads, but our railroads which have reached the highest efficiency in their history must maintain this efficiency. With a higher cost of labor and materials, they can not reduce their freight rates and therefore it is necessary to secure some other form of transportation in order to meet the requirements of the Nation. Under such conditions we must turn to our natural waterways with which Providence has blessed us.

In order to accomplish this we must deepen our rivers to permit modern barge transportation, deepen the outlet to the Great Lakes to permit ocean-going shipping, and connect the Lakes with the Atlantic into a definite transportation system.

This would give us 12,000 miles of connected inland waterway transportation, reaching from Duluth in the North to New York in the East, from Chicago to New Orleans, from Pittsburgh to Sioux City, from New Orleans to Houston, Tex., thus making a network of inland waterways larger than any in the world.

The Rivers and Harbors Committee will on Friday consider in the House a bill containing many projects that have accumulated since the last bill was passed in 1927. A 3-year period has elapsed from the time the last bill was passed until this bill was reported. Consequently, the total amount of this bill is larger than the usual bill. It will amount to, in round numbers, in the neighborhood of \$111,000,000.

These projects have been well distributed throughout the United States, beginning at a point in northern Massachusetts, along the Atlantic seaboard to Florida, and then across the Gulf of Mexico to the farthest Texas points, and from southern California to northern Washington, taking in Alaska. All of the coast harbors are well provided for.

The Great Lakes system, the greatest inland-water system in the world, has received very generous treatment. Twenty-nine million dollars is authorized for the deepening of the channels to 24 feet. Every State bordering on the Great Lakes, starting with western New York, western Pennsylvania, northern Ohio, northern Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, and Wisconsin have fared well by the allocation of funds and a completion of necessary harbors and inland rivers.

The Central West, which includes all of the States between the Alleghenies and the Rockies, have been very generously treated in this bill, and I want at this time to impress upon the Congressmen and Senators who come from this part of the country and the South that this is one bill that will meet their requirements. We have all been generously treated; a sum of \$42,344,487 has been authorized for our rivers in this part of the country and \$37,929,237 to the Great Lakes section. And while some may complain that they have been unjustly treated, nevertheless, it is a fair bill and no one in this section of the country should rebel. It is my honest belief that those of us who have been fighting for these many years have now come into our own. We should be satisfied with what is given us; we should be willing to vote as one man for the entire bill.

In the development of a waterway bill, there are always kicks and complaints—there may be some against this bill—one section of the country complaining on account of the advantages gained by another section. That should be avoided, if possible, because remember the destruction of this bill would mean setting back waterway development for two years. Remember, it is only in the long session of Congress that we are able to develop and pass waterway legislation. If this bill

should fail, we will be faced two years from now with going back and taking up the same projects in regular order and add additional projects that will be presented by the engineers. So I am asking you not to make this sectional legislation but make it legislation for the whole country.

THE ERIE CANAL

Many false statements have been made in reference to the Erie Canal. It has been said that the West traded with New York. I deny that anything of the sort was ever contemplated by the committee.

Early in the hearings, there was a unanimous vote of the entire committee to give consideration to the Erie Canal because it was the belief that by making a connection between the Great Lakes and the Atlantic Ocean it would be a great advantage for the transportation of grain and manufactured products of the West to the seaboard and would be equally advantageous for importations and domestic freight through the canal westward.

As the Erie Canal serves both domestic and foreign commerce, the very important finding is made that terminal and transportation facilities have been provided at all important canal points, with a 2,000,000-bushel grain elevator at New York City and 1,000,000-bushel grain elevators at Oswego and Albany. The terminals have direct railroad connections and are open to the public on equal terms.

The Erie Canal carried 1,424,434 tons of traffic in 1920; in 1928 this had grown to 3,089,988 tons, an increase of 117 per cent. And, mind you, this tremendous growth has resulted despite the fact that the project depth has not been obtained.

The construction and operation of modern type vessels which would carry the largest cargo possible on a 12-foot depth has been discouraged and prevented by the failure to obtain the project depth to make the canal as successful as it would be to bring about transportation of tonnage at the lowest rate on a 12-foot depth.

A somewhat greater depth than this, say 13 feet, must be obtained and maintained in order to make this canal a success.

It is reasonable to suppose that a canal of such wonderful proportions, of such great opportunities of carrying the freight from the West to the East, and from the East to the West, with very small expense, properly managed by the United States Government will become one of the important transportation canals of the Nation. By connecting the Great Lakes with the Atlantic, which in time will be connected up with all of the great western country, gives opportunity that could not be supplied in many years to come.

What is needed now is quick action and this we can have within a two or three year period.

I regard the Erie Canal as one of the outstanding projects in this general rivers and harbors bill.

The Illinois waterway has been amicably settled. The diversion question is entirely out of it. Members on the committee of the Great Lakes States have sanctioned it by a unanimous vote by roll call and the attorneys for the Great Lakes system and the Lake Carriers Association and the attorney general of the State of Illinois agreed upon the language that is in this bill.

In order to make the Mississippi system a success it is necessary to complete the Illinois waterway so as to make the connection between Lake Michigan and the Mississippi River. When that is done, then it will be an easy matter to make these channels pay their own way.

The upper Mississippi River has been treated fairly and the only way it could be treated.

All projects are adopted on the recommendation of the engineers' report. It was impossible for the engineers to complete the report on the upper Mississippi River, so an interim report was made. It left the committee without authority to adopt the full project. However, it is the belief of the committee that when the engineers' report is complete it will recommend a 9-foot channel from the mouth of the Illinois River to St. Paul and Minneapolis, and I am sure that it is in the minds of the members of the committee that if a favorable report is made, they will very gladly adopt it.

The upper Missouri River, which is in about the same position, will be allocated in this bill \$15,000,000 to be spent above Kansas City on the upper Missouri within a 3-year period. This is all the engineers could expend, and it will take them in a northerly direction very close to the city of Omaha.

The Tennessee River, which has a full report, is in the same position as the other rivers, and \$3,000,000 has been allotted for it, which will give it a good start. All of the rivers of the Central West have been generously treated.

We can not make a success of the inland waterway system without reaching the seaboard.

If the Erie Canal, at some future date, is turned over to the United States Government and is made a 13-foot channel, it will immediately give us a waterway from the Central West to the Atlantic coast.

When the Mississippi River is a completed project with a 9-foot channel, it will give the Central West an outlet by the Gulf of Mexico and through the Great Lakes and Erie Canal to the Atlantic Ocean. Consequently it will be of great advantage to every State between the Rocky and the Allegheny Mountains.

The St. Lawrence route has been treated fairly. Adoption of a 27-foot channel connecting Ogdensburg, N. Y. and Lake Ontario.

The development of these inland waterways, which connects up, as I said before, the Great Lakes system with the Atlantic coast, will be an incentive, in my judgment, to bring to a final conclusion the efforts that are being put forth for the building of the St. Lawrence waterway.

There is not a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee but who favors a waterway through the St. Lawrence. We are, all, for that project but why wait indefinitely upon Canada; we are ready now, but they have never made any overture to this country that would consummate this great project. So, I say to the House of Representatives, study this bill carefully, lay aside your prejudices, clasp hands of friendship with the East and the West, the North and the South, carry this bill through to a successful conclusion and you will begin a great development of waterways that will eventually make our transportation the greatest of any country in the world. [Applause.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHREVE], who is chairman of the subcommittee having in charge the appropriation bill for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and the Departments of Commerce and Labor, I ask that he may be excused from attendance upon the sessions of the House for three weeks on account of attending an administrative conference of commercial attachés, Department of Commerce, at Panama, and then going to Los Angeles to attend a conference of trade commissioners.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, granted.

CUSTER NATIONAL FOREST

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the Public Lands, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6130) to exempt the Custer National Forest from the operation of the forest homestead law, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Utah asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 6130, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has the gentleman consulted the minority members of the committee?

Mr. COLTON. Yes; the matter was taken up in the committee this morning and I was directed by the committee to take this action.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection; and the Chair appointed the following conferees: Messrs. COLTON, SMITH of Idaho, and EVANS of Montana.

CONGESTION OF BUSINESS IN THE FEDERAL COURTS

The SPEAKER. Under the order of the House the Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BACHMANN] for 45 minutes.

Mr. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that certain tables that I have prepared, showing the disposition of cases in the Federal courts in every State of the Union, may be incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, on March 7 last I discussed the subject of congestion in the Federal courts in relation to prohibition enforcement. To-day I am prepared to discuss congestion in the Federal courts from all causes.

The President in his message to Congress on January 13, 1930, transmitting comments upon proposals to improve enforcement of the criminal laws of the United States said:

In my previous messages I have requested the attention of the Congress to the urgent situation which has grown up in the matter of enforcement of Federal criminal laws.

Increasing enactment of Federal criminal laws has finally culminated in a burden upon the Federal courts of a character for which they are ill designed, and in many cases beyond their capacity.

The President recommended, in part, provision for adequate court and prosecuting officials.

The Attorney General in his letter to the President on January 13, 1930, said:

Congestion in the courts deserves utmost consideration. In many districts the Federal courts are unable to cope with the volume of business brought before them. This results in delay with weakening of evidence and difficulty in obtaining convictions.

The Attorney General also said:

Some additional relief for congested conditions will be afforded by providing additional judges in a few districts already recommended by the conference of senior circuit judges and by me.

The Attorney General recommended, in part, immediate consideration of legislation to relieve congestion in the United States courts by providing some additional judges.

The Commission on Law Observance in its preliminary report, dated November 21, 1929, stated:

From various parts of the country come complaints of congestion of the Federal courts.

The President, the Attorney General, and the Commission on Law Observance all agree that the Federal courts are congested and that action should immediately be taken by the Congress to relieve the situation.

However, before legislation to relieve the situation can be enacted it must be determined whether the congestion is general throughout the United States or whether it is "spotty" and confined to a few certain districts. To determine this, I have made a close study of the reports of the Attorney General concerning the volume of business transacted in each Federal district for the period beginning with the fiscal year 1926 and ending with the fiscal year 1929. I have prepared certain tables, which will be inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, which show the business transacted in each of the Federal districts in the United States, exclusive of Alaska, Hawaii, and Porto Rico.

In these tables, litigation in which the United States is a party, is listed as civil cases; litigation in which citizens of the United States are parties, is listed as private cases; while all violations of the various criminal laws are listed as criminal cases. Bankruptcy proceedings are not included in these figures.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BACHMANN. I yield.

Mr. CRISP. Does your list show how many were tried and how many disposed of without a trial?

Mr. BACHMANN. It does not. I made that analysis in a speech on March 7, when I analyzed prohibition cases only.

Mr. CRISP. Unfortunately, I did not hear the gentleman's speech.

Mr. THATCHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BACHMANN. Yes.

Mr. THATCHER. Has the gentleman anything to show what percentage of these cases were misdemeanors and what percentage were felonies?

Mr. BACHMANN. I did not go into the analysis of the misdemeanors and the felonies, because it would have entailed too many figures.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BACHMANN. I yield.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Does the gentleman's analysis show the number of criminal cases actually tried that pleaded guilty?

Mr. BACHMANN. That analysis was given in the other speech on March 7.

CASES COMMENCED

It may be of interest to know that in the 85 Federal districts in the United States, including the District of Columbia, for the 4-year period beginning with the fiscal year 1926 and ending with the fiscal year 1929, there was a total of 464,815 civil, private, and criminal cases commenced, an average of 116,200 cases each year. Of the total cases for the period, 165,885 were civil and private and 298,930 were criminal cases. Over one-third, or approximately 36 per cent, of the total cases commenced during the period were civil and private litigation, while almost two-thirds, or 64 per cent, of the total cases were criminal prosecutions.

In other words, approximately two-thirds of the cases brought into the Federal courts were for violations of the criminal laws of the United States.

Of the 298,930 criminal cases commenced during the period, 196,413, or over 64 per cent, were prohibition cases.

Of the total of all cases commenced during the period, over 42 per cent, or 196,413 cases, were prohibition cases; 102,517, or 22 per cent, were criminal cases other than prohibition; 165,885, or 36 per cent, were civil and private cases, showing that the greatest percentage of the total cases commenced in the Federal courts were prohibition cases.

For the fiscal year 1926 there were 105,831 cases commenced, 104,178 for the fiscal year 1927, 126,532 for the fiscal year 1928, and 128,185 for the fiscal year 1929. There were 22,354 more cases commenced in the fiscal year 1929 than were commenced in 1926. This means that the business of the Federal courts is steadily increasing.

The State of New York with 78,419 civil, private, and criminal cases commenced during the 4-year period ranks first in the volume of business commenced.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. BACHMANN. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Has the gentleman considered the necessity of the Federal judicial system in New York? There is hardly one case in the southern district of that court that could not be brought before a State court. The only cases that are tried there are cases in which an attempt is made to evade the State courts by the public utilities. But nobody understands why there is a Federal judicial system in New York.

Mr. BACHMANN. I know that in the southern district of New York at this period there were commenced 14,897 cases.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. They could just as well have been brought before the State courts. The reason why they are brought before the United States courts is to evade the State courts, as in the case of some of our utility companies.

Mr. BACHMANN. The District of Columbia with 65,743 cases was second and Pennsylvania with 20,874 cases third.

The least number of cases was commenced in Wyoming with 212, Rhode Island was next with 502, and Delaware next with 782.

The greatest number of criminal cases for the period were commenced in the District of Columbia, where 49,187 criminal cases were started. New York was second with 47,896, and Kentucky third with 16,094.

The least number of criminal cases was commenced in the State of Wyoming with 124, Rhode Island next with 336, and Delaware next with 358.

There were more criminal cases started during the 4-year period in the States of New York, Kentucky, Texas, West Virginia, Illinois, and the District of Columbia than in the remaining 43 States combined. In other words, there were 151,055 criminal cases commenced in the 5 States mentioned and the District of Columbia, while there were only 147,875 criminal cases commenced in the other 43 States combined.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BACHMANN. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Would not a proper deduction from the figures the gentleman has given be that enforcement in the five States was more active than in the other parts of the country?

Mr. BACHMANN. You can not tell about that. The law may be better enforced and there may be more criminal violations there. I do not know, and I do not know that anybody else can tell.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Does the gentleman happen to have the population?

Mr. BACHMANN. The population of New York is about 11,000,000.

Mr. ARENTZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BACHMANN. I yield.

Mr. ARENTZ. In view of the similarity of numbers regarding the number of cases in the United States courts of New York and the District of Columbia, taking into consideration the fact that there are six times more people in the southern district of New York than in Washington, would that indicate that there are six times more criminals in the District of Columbia per capita than in New York?

Mr. BACHMANN. Not at all; in the States we have State courts that dispose of criminal cases. In the District of Columbia all violations of the criminal laws are handled in the Federal courts. That is why we find so many criminal cases in the District of Columbia.

Excluding the District of Columbia, there were more criminal cases commenced in the southern district of New York than in any other Federal district in the United States. There were 23,384 criminal cases commenced during the 4-year period in that district alone. The eastern district of Kentucky was sec-

ond with 12,080 cases and the southern district of West Virginia third with 9,738 cases.

The greatest number of civil and private cases was commenced in the State of New York, where 30,523 cases were started during the period. The District of Columbia was second with 16,556 cases and the State of Pennsylvania third with 10,989 cases.

The least number of civil and private cases commenced during the 4-year period was in the State of Wyoming with 88 cases. Rhode Island was next with 166 and Vermont next with 249.

CASES TERMINATED

By cases terminated is meant the number of cases disposed of during the 4-year period.

There were 476,333 civil, private, and criminal cases terminated in all the States and the District of Columbia during the period, 113,361 cases in the fiscal year 1926, 108,538 cases in the year 1927, 128,329 in the year 1928, and 128,270 in the year 1929.

Approximately one-half of all the cases terminated were completed in the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Texas, Kentucky, Illinois, and the District of Columbia. This means that there was almost as much business transacted for the period in the Federal courts of the 5 States mentioned and the District of Columbia as was completed in all of the remaining 43 States in the Union combined.

The largest volume of business transacted was in the State of New York, where 81,829 cases were terminated. The District of Columbia was second with 63,268 cases completed, and the State of Pennsylvania third with 22,896 cases completed.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BACHMANN. I yield.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Does that include both supreme court cases and municipal court cases?

Mr. BACHMANN. I am discussing Federal district courts. Criminal cases are handled in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia.

Mr. RAMSEYER. The figures for the District of Columbia only include criminal cases that come before the District Supreme Court?

Mr. BACHMANN. Yes; petty cases, traffic violations, and so forth, are handled in the municipal court.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Of course in other districts no petty cases come into the Federal courts.

Mr. BACHMANN. No; the criminal cases here are handled in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Are all the prohibition cases handled in that way in the District of Columbia?

Mr. BACHMANN. That is my understanding; the police court handles petty cases like traffic violations, and so forth.

Mr. STEVENSON. The Supreme Court of the District of Columbia occupies the same place as the district courts of the United States?

Mr. BACHMANN. Exactly, the gentleman is right. Next to the District of Columbia, more cases were completed in the southern district of New York, where 41,324 cases were terminated during the period. The eastern district of New York was next with 21,002 cases completed, and the eastern district of Kentucky next with 14,519 cases completed.

CASES PENDING

By cases pending is meant the number of cases remaining on the court dockets which the courts have been unable to dispose of.

At the end of the fiscal year 1926 there were 94,919 civil, private, and criminal cases pending in all the Federal courts. At the end of the fiscal year 1929 there were 89,540 civil, private, and criminal cases pending. In other words, there were 5,379 fewer cases pending in 1929 than there were in 1926. At the average rate the cases are being disposed of each year, it would take the courts approximately one year to dispose of all pending cases alone.

Of the 89,540 cases of all kinds pending at the end of the fiscal year 1929, 58,162 were civil and private cases, while 31,378 were criminal cases. In other words, approximately 65 per cent of the pending cases were civil and private and 35 per cent were criminal cases. According to the large volume of civil and private cases pending on the dockets, it is apparent that the courts are unable to dispose of them due to the excessive number of criminal cases necessary to be heard.

It is interesting to note that of the 31,378 criminal cases pending at the end of the fiscal year 1929, 18,650, or approximately 59 per cent, were prohibition cases.

The southern district of New York, with a total of 11,354 civil, private, and criminal cases pending at the end of the fiscal year 1929, had more pending cases than any other district in the United States. The eastern district of New York, with a total of 8,803 pending civil and private cases, had more civil

and private cases pending at the end of the fiscal year 1929 than any other district, while the District of Columbia, with 3,076 cases, had more criminal cases pending than any other district.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BACHMANN. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Of course, these figures have been discussed a number of times when the question was up about increasing the judges in both of those districts, and the figures which the gentleman gives for the number of cases pending in both those courts are infinitesimal compared with the number of cases pending in the State courts in the same districts and in the same locations. Where the gentleman mentions 8,000 or 11,000 it will run to 30,000 in the State courts having about the same jurisdiction.

Mr. BACHMANN. If I started to analyze the situation in all of the State courts in every State of the Union, we would have such a mass of figures here that we could not comprehend them.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. But where you have a big place like New York, with a congested population, you are bound to have this large number of cases pending, no matter what you do about it. The State courts have tried adding judges and have not succeeded one bit. The southern district of New York and the eastern district of New York have tried adding judges and they have not cut down the calendar. This is a condition that is just like the traffic condition. As fast as they build subways, they will be overcrowded, and as fast as you increase the personnel of the courts, they will be overcrowded with cases, and you will never catch up with them.

Mr. BACHMANN. But the gentleman understands there is a contrary view to that expressed by the gentleman, because the President of the United States and the Attorney General and some of the senior circuit court judges of the circuit court of appeals in this country, recognizing these conditions, have suggested as a remedy some additional district judges in these most congested districts.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. I have said on this floor before that I have yet to find a judge or a bar association or hardly a lawyer who is against more judges. They are all intuitively and innately for them, from the circuit court down.

Mr. BACHMANN. I think the gentleman is right about that in some instances.

New Hampshire, with 59 civil, private, and criminal cases pending, had the least number of cases pending at the end of the fiscal year 1929. New Hampshire also had the least number of civil and private cases pending at the end of the fiscal year 1929, while Delaware, with 7, had fewer criminal cases pending.

There were 45,761 total cases pending at the end of the fiscal year 1929 in the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, New Jersey, and the District of Columbia, while there was only a total of 43,779 cases pending in the remaining 44 States of the Union. In other words, there were more cases pending in the 4 States mentioned and the District of Columbia than in all of the 44 other States combined.

It can readily be seen from an examination of the business of each of the Federal districts that the congestion is only "spotty"; that is, confined to a few districts and not general throughout all the States.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMISSION ON LAW OBSERVANCE

The Commission on Law Observance considered three plans for relieving this congestion: One, to increase the number of Federal judges; another, to create inferior Federal courts to be known as Federal police courts; and the third, to utilize the present machinery of the courts by enlarging the powers of the United States commissioners. The commission recommended the third plan, that of enlarging the powers of the United States commissioners.

Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BACHMANN. Yes.

Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma. Is it not clear that the acceptance of the first recommendation, the appointment of additional Federal judges, ultimately will be the safest course and provide the most efficient and prompt dispatch of legal business as well as the most economical?

Mr. BACHMANN. The gentleman from Oklahoma is entirely correct. I will say to the gentleman that in the past week I introduced 16 bills asking for the appointment of 18 additional Federal judges. Those bills were introduced after I had had time and opportunity to study the facts in each Federal district, and I considered very carefully the private and civil litigation pending as well as the number of civil and private cases commenced and terminated. I was guided in my proposal of this legislation by the facts I found. I believe the appoint-

ment of these additional judges will relieve the congested conditions prevailing in our Federal courts. The President, the Attorney General, and the Commission on Law Observance all agree that we have this congestion. We have 148 district judges in the United States, who disposed of one-half million cases in four years. That is an average of over 800 cases per judge per year. That is a vast amount of work. Some of our district judges are breaking in health on account of excessive work, especially in Texas and Minnesota.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BACHMANN. I yield.

Mr. RAMSEYER. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BACHMANN] speaks of 800 cases, on an average, for each Federal district judge. That of itself does not mean a great deal. The gentleman knows, as he stated a while ago, that 92 per cent of the prohibition cases are concluded by pleas of guilty.

Mr. BACHMANN. Yes.

Mr. RAMSEYER. The gentleman knows there are a great many civil cases filed, which are settled out of court, but before the figures mean anything at all—that is, an average of 800 per judge—we would have to know how many cases actually went to trial and how much of the time of the judge was required for their trial.

Mr. BACHMANN. I can not tell the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. RAMSEYER] how many cases were actually terminated in court.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Terminated, how?

Mr. BACHMANN. By final disposition, either by compromise or trial.

Mr. RAMSEYER. But, if they are compromised they may not take a minute of the time of the judge.

Mr. BACHMANN. I assume in a good many of the compromised cases the judge would have been required to pass on the pleadings and consider preliminary motions prior to the time of compromise.

Mr. RAMSEYER. That may or may not have involved the time of the judge.

Mr. BACHMANN. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I have often seen figures as to the number of cases pending in Federal courts, and a plea made for an additional judge because of the heavy docket. Figures of that kind are meaningless. There must be some other way of judging the amount of work which a judge does than merely statistics as to the number of cases.

Mr. BACHMANN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. RAMSEYER] is absolutely right. Before a thorough understanding of the situation is had, there must be two or three different things considered. First, the amount of business that is transacted according to the number of cases, must be known. That is an element which must be considered. Secondly, the character and nature of the work must be considered in that particular court. The character and nature of the work must be secured from the judge himself, or the senior circuit judge of the circuit court of appeals having jurisdiction, and from the Attorney General. If the judges and the Attorney General do not know about the character and nature of the work, how can it be ascertained? All these facts must be considered in deciding whether or not additional judges are necessary.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I think the gentleman is correct, that the judgment of the Attorney General and the conference of senior circuit judges should be given great weight, although not be accepted as conclusive proof. One case which a judge must try may take more time and work than 100 other cases that are disposed of in one way or another.

Mr. BACHMANN. That is true, but, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. RAMSEYER] will understand that I have no plan and no program about this entire affair. Being a member of the Committee on the Judiciary I was asked to examine the records of each Federal district for the last four years, in order to ascertain the amount of business transacted in the Federal courts. I have spent the last five or six weeks getting that information together to present to the Judiciary Committee and the House.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I want to say to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BACHMANN] that the gentleman has done a great deal of conscientious, intelligent work on the task to which he was assigned, and the information he is giving us now and which he gave us on the 7th of March is not only valuable to the membership of the House but to the country, and especially the bar of the country.

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BACHMANN. I yield.

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Is not the delay which occurs in the trial of civil cases—that is, the length of time that elapses between the time a civil suit is filed and the time it can be

brought to trial—good evidence of the congestion in the Federal courts?

Mr. BACHMANN. Yes; that is true.

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. That is an indication of the congestion?

Mr. BACHMANN. Yes; it is.

I want to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that when the Jones law was enacted it automatically required an indictment for every violation of the national prohibition act save and except unlawful possession and maintaining a nuisance. Prior to that time the district attorney could proceed in misdemeanor cases by information or complaint, and did not have to submit the cases to a grand jury. Since the enactment of the Jones law every case is a potential felony and must be submitted to a grand jury, save and except cases of unlawful possession and maintaining a nuisance.

After calling attention to the fact that the plan involves several constitutional questions the commission suggested that these questions might be overcome by amending the Jones law.

The suggested amendment is to define "slight and casual" violations and to provide for penalties in those cases such as to keep them within the category of petty offenses.

The commission suggests that a new paragraph be added to section 29, Title II, of the national prohibition act, making the penalty for each petty offense a fine of not to exceed \$500 or confinement in jail, without hard labor, not to exceed six months, or both.

It can readily be seen, and I do not think it can be seriously doubted, that before the commission's plan, to have the United States commissioners hear these petty offenses, can be put into operation it will be necessary to first amend the Jones law by defining these petty offenses. As it is now, all offenses under the Jones law, except unlawful possession and maintaining a nuisance, are potential felonies. Consequently there are no petty offenses that the United States commissioners could hear other than those of unlawful possession and nuisance.

Apparently considerable opposition has developed to these proposals. Certain groups are opposed to any amendment to the Jones law because it is claimed it will reduce the penalties for substantial violations of the prohibition law as now provided by that law. Certain groups are opposed to conferring this power on the United States commissioners because it is claimed it will interfere with the constitutional right of trial by jury.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. BACHMANN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Is the gentleman prepared to say that relief would be afforded to any extent by an act which would authorize the defendant in any case to waive a trial by jury?

Mr. BACHMANN. If you will refer to the Record of March 7, 1930, you will find in my remarks that about 92 per cent of those convicted for violations of the national prohibition law plead guilty.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I think the gentleman must realize that there are many serious criminal cases that it takes a long time to try with a jury, and relief might be given by allowing a jury to be waived.

Mr. BACHMANN. I am not prepared at this moment to discuss that.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. BACHMANN. Yes.

Mr. MAAS. If there were no Federal prohibition law there would be no congestion in our Federal courts, would there?

Mr. BACHMANN. No; I do not believe that. The enormous increase in civil, private, and criminal litigation has added considerable congestion in our Federal courts. Prohibition has contributed to the congestion in a great measure.

Mr. MAAS. It has largely contributed to it, has it not?

Mr. BACHMANN. I do not doubt that.

Mr. MAAS. The increase has been out of proportion to the increase in the normal population?

Mr. BACHMANN. No; I do not think so.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. May I ask the gentleman whether he has considered the expediency of increasing the jurisdictional amount in civil litigation that goes into the district courts beyond \$3,000?

Mr. BACHMANN. I have not gone into that phase of the question.

With this situation, it is very doubtful whether any legislation in accordance with the recommendation of the Commission on Law Observance, will be enacted at this time. Consequently, the Congress is faced with the problem of either leaving the matter as it is, or relieving the congestion by the enactment of legislation for the appointment of additional judges.

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BACHMANN. Yes.

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Right along that line, is it not a fact that Congress from year to year is enacting laws creating new crimes and adding work for the Federal courts, and must we not recognize that and increase the Federal judiciary from time to time to keep up with the new laws that we are passing from year to year?

Mr. BACHMANN. The gentleman is absolutely right. Every session of Congress we enact legislation, legislating some citizen of the United States to the penitentiary, and every time we enact a criminal law making more penalties, we bring into our Federal courts more criminal cases. For instance, at this session of Congress the House passed a bill giving the Federal courts jurisdiction in larceny cases where the stolen property was transported to another State and where the amount involved was over \$300, as the gentleman knows.

Personally, I am of the opinion that by providing additional judges in the following districts, the congestion which now exists will be greatly relieved.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BACHMANN. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Of course one law that was enacted is the cause of 50 per cent of the present population of our Federal and State prisons, where they have also local laws.

Mr. BACHMANN. I have those figures and expect to touch on that situation a little bit later, though not to-day; but I say to the gentleman that, so far as I have gone in this survey, not 50 per cent of the prisoners in the Federal penitentiaries and not 50 per cent of the prisoners in the State penitentiaries are there because of the violation of any one law.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Very nearly that amount?

Mr. BACHMANN. There are about one-fourth of the prisoners in the Federal penitentiaries who are there for violation of the prohibition law, and I think that is what the gentleman refers to; but only about one-tenth of the prisoners confined in the State penitentiaries are there for violation of the State prohibition laws.

Mr. DUNBAR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. BACHMANN. Yes.

Mr. DUNBAR. Does not the gentleman believe that the penal institutions of the United States are so overcrowded that it is practically inhuman to put any more burden on those penitentiaries, and that it is a reflection on our civilization that more unfortunate men will have to endure the crowded conditions that are imposed on them?

Mr. BACHMANN. I will answer that in a speech which I contemplate making at a future time. The Federal penitentiaries are not overly congested with prisoners who have violated the national prohibition act. Only about one-fourth of the inmates of all the Federal penitentiaries are there for violations of the prohibition law. But every Federal penitentiary is overcrowded. They have about 4,000 more prisoners in all the Federal prisons than the capacity of those institutions. When you talk about the State penitentiaries I may say that I have letters from nearly all the State penitentiaries giving information which I have asked for, which I believe will show that fewer inmates are confined in the State penitentiaries for violation of the State prohibition laws, in proportion, than are confined in the Federal penitentiaries for violations of the national prohibition act.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

There are seven judges in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia.

For the last four fiscal years there were commenced in the District of Columbia 1,027 civil cases, 15,529 private cases, and 49,187 criminal cases, or a total of 65,743 cases.

For the fiscal year 1926 there was a total of 14,415 cases commenced, while for the fiscal year 1929 there was a total of 17,433 cases commenced, showing that there were 3,018 more cases commenced in 1929 than there were in 1926, which means that the business of the courts is on the increase.

At the end of the fiscal year 1926 there was a total of 7,148 cases pending, while at the end of the fiscal year 1929 there was a total of 7,415 cases pending, showing that the number of pending cases is also increasing.

Twenty-five per cent of the cases commenced were civil and private cases, while 75 per cent were criminal cases.

There were more criminal cases commenced during the 4-year period in the District of Columbia than in any other State or District in the United States. In fact there were more criminal cases commenced in the District of Columbia than in the 28 combined States of Alabama, Arizona, New Jersey, Montana, Mississippi, South Carolina, Virginia, Massachusetts, Nebraska, Wisconsin, Indiana, Iowa, Idaho, Oregon, Colorado, New Mex-

ico, New Hampshire, South Dakota, Nevada, Maine, Vermont, Kansas, Utah, Connecticut, North Dakota, Delaware, Rhode Island, and Wyoming. This may or may not be significant, because many criminal cases are disposed of by the State courts in the States, while in the District of Columbia all criminal cases are disposed of in the Federal courts.

Of all the criminal cases commenced in the District of Columbia, 8,292, or approximately one-sixth, were prohibition cases.

The seven judges in the Federal court of the District of Columbia terminated 63,268 cases in the 4-year period, or an average of 9,038 cases for each judge for that period. This shows a yearly average of 2,259 cases terminated by each of the seven judges.

It is believed that provision should be made for two additional judges for the District of Columbia.

NEW YORK

The business conducted by the courts in the State of New York is unusually heavy. It must be remembered that there is a population of about 11,000,000 in that State. It must also be remembered that New York does not have a State prohibition law, and that the whole load of prohibition enforcement is on the Federal courts.

During the 4-year period there were 15,013 civil cases commenced, 15,510 private cases, and 47,896 criminal cases, a total of 78,419 cases commenced. Of the total cases commenced, 61 per cent were criminal cases. Of the criminal cases commenced 42,899, or 89 per cent, were prohibition cases.

There are four Federal districts in the State of New York, with 17 presiding judges.

In the northern district there was a total of 11,300 cases commenced for the period; in the eastern district 20,085; in the southern district 38,277; and in the western district 8,757.

For the fiscal year 1926 there was a total of 17,197 cases commenced in the State, while for the year 1929, 21,741 cases were commenced, showing there were 4,544 more cases commenced for the year 1929 than were commenced in the year 1926, which means that the business of the Federal courts in the State of New York is on the increase.

There was a total of 29,318 cases pending in all four districts of the State for the fiscal year 1926. At the end of the fiscal year 1929, 26,399 cases were pending.

Of all the pending cases for the fiscal year 1929, 5,270 were civil, 13,774 were private, and 6,815 were criminal cases.

At present there are two judges in the northern district, five in the eastern district, eight in the southern district, and two in the western district.

There were nine judges in the southern district, but Judge Winslow resigned, and the act providing for an additional judge to which place Judge Winslow was appointed, provided there was to be no successor.

It is believed that there should be an additional judge for the northern district, one for the eastern district, two in the southern district, and one in the western district, of New York, a total of five additional judges for the State.

WEST VIRGINIA

There is a very large volume of business transacted by the two Federal courts in West Virginia. While West Virginia ranks twenty-sixth in population, it ranks seventh in the volume of business commenced in its Federal courts, and fifth in the number of criminal cases commenced. In fact there were one-fifth as many cases commenced in West Virginia during the 4-year period, as were commenced in the State of New York. New York has 17 judges while West Virginia has two.

During the 4-year period there were 1,932 civil cases commenced, 658 private cases, and 12,589 criminal cases, a total of 15,179 cases.

Of all the cases commenced, 82 per cent were criminal cases. Of the criminal cases commenced, 10,789, or 85 per cent, were prohibition cases.

There were more cases commenced in the State of West Virginia than in the combined 13 States of Idaho, New Hampshire, New Mexico, South Dakota, Nevada, Maine, North Dakota, Connecticut, Vermont, Utah, Delaware, Rhode Island, and Wyoming.

For the fiscal year 1926 there was a total of 3,652 cases commenced, while there was a total of 3,654 cases commenced for the fiscal year 1929.

At the end of the fiscal year 1926 there was a total of 1,645 cases pending, and at the end of the fiscal year 1929 there was a total of 1,476 cases pending.

Of the cases pending at the end of the fiscal year 1929, 341 were civil, 253 were private, and 882 were criminal cases.

There are two Federal districts in West Virginia, with one judge for each district. It is believed that because of the large number of cases in West Virginia an additional district should

be created. There are sufficient places for holding court already provided, and if a new district were created very little additional expense would be needed.

KENTUCKY

Like West Virginia, there is a large number of cases handled each year in Kentucky.

For the 4-year period there were 1,411 civil cases, 1,168 private, and 16,094 criminal cases commenced, or a total of 18,673 cases commenced.

Of all the cases commenced, 86 per cent were criminal cases. Of the criminal cases commenced 13,828, or 85 per cent, were prohibition cases.

There was a total of 4,897 cases commenced for the fiscal year 1926, and 5,199 cases commenced for the fiscal year 1929, an increase of 302 cases in the fiscal year 1929.

For the fiscal year 1926 there was a total of 2,099 cases pending, while at the end of the fiscal year 1929, there was a total of 1,179 cases pending.

Of the cases pending at the end of the fiscal year 1929, 227 were civil cases, 438 private, and 514 criminal cases.

With a total of 16,094 criminal cases commenced during the period, Kentucky ranks third of all the States of the Union in the number of criminal cases commenced. It is surpassed only by the State of New York and the District of Columbia.

There were one-third as many criminal cases commenced in Kentucky as were commenced in the State of New York.

Mrs. LANGLEY. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. BACHMANN. Yes.

Mrs. LANGLEY. The gentleman knows there are two districts in Kentucky, the eastern and western districts. Is it not a fact that in the eastern district of Kentucky there is a greater volume of business than in any other district in the United States? Is that not a fact?

Mr. BACHMANN. Well, I would not say there is more business in the eastern district of Kentucky than in any other district in the United States, but I will say that the eastern district of Kentucky ranks fourth of the 85 Federal judicial districts in the United States in the volume of business commenced in that State. It is exceeded only by the District of Columbia, the southern district of New York, and the eastern district of New York.

Mrs. LANGLEY. Does not the gentleman's survey or investigation show that there must be some relief in the eastern district of Kentucky?

Mr. BACHMANN. I am inclined to believe that Congress ought to give some relief to the State of Kentucky as soon as possible.

Mrs. LANGLEY. The gentleman is familiar with the bill I have pending before the Judiciary Committee creating a third judicial district, to be known as the southern district?

Mr. BACHMANN. Yes.

Mrs. LANGLEY. Knowing, as the gentleman does, that it contains a mountainous area and that the facilities of travel are very difficult in that section, is it not the opinion of the gentleman that the greatest relief for that section will be in the creation of this district?

Mr. BACHMANN. I have said you ought to have an additional judge or district in Kentucky, but as I understand that is a controversial question at this time.

Mrs. LANGLEY. What is the gentleman's final conclusion?

Mr. BACHMANN. I would think you ought to have a new district, and there is no question but what you should have either an additional judge or a new district.

There are two Federal districts in Kentucky and two judges.

Mr. THATCHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BACHMANN. Yes.

Mr. THATCHER. Is it not true that in the western district of Kentucky we feel we are entitled to relief just the same as they feel they are entitled to relief in the eastern district?

Mr. BACHMANN. I do not want to get mixed up in your political controversies in Kentucky. That can be fought out in the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Do they want three or six new judges in Kentucky?

Mr. BACHMANN. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that they only have two judges in the State of Kentucky, and yet that State is doing one-fourth as much business as they are doing in New York, and the State of New York has 17 judges.

CALIFORNIA

The State of California has two Federal districts, with three judges in each district.

During the 4-year period there were 3,579 civil cases, 3,087 private, and 7,937 criminal cases commenced in the State, a total of 14,513 cases.

Of the cases commenced, 55 per cent were criminal cases. Of the criminal cases commenced, 4,420, or 55 per cent, were prohibition cases.

For the fiscal year 1926 there was a total of 3,373 cases commenced, while for the fiscal year 1929 there was a total of 3,975 cases commenced, showing there were 602 more cases commenced in 1929 than in 1926. Business of the Federal courts in the State of California is on the increase. The northern district is carrying the largest load, with a total of 8,957 cases commenced during the period. A total of 5,556 cases were commenced in the southern district of the State.

At the end of the fiscal year 1926 there was a total of 3,460 cases pending in the State, while at the end of the fiscal year 1929 there was a total of 2,969 cases pending, a decrease of 491 cases.

Of the total number of cases pending at the end of 1929, 1,330 were pending in the northern district and 1,639 in the southern district.

California ranks eighth among the States in the number of cases commenced.

Because of the increase of business in the State of California, it is believed that an additional judge should be provided who would be appointed to serve in both the northern and southern districts.

OKLAHOMA

In the State of Oklahoma there are three Federal districts, with one judge for each district.

For the 4-year period there were 957 civil cases, 2,737 private cases, and 9,910 criminal cases, a total of 13,604 cases commenced in the State.

Of all the cases commenced, 72 per cent were criminal cases. Of the criminal cases commenced, 6,302, or 63 per cent, were prohibition cases.

For the fiscal year 1926 there was a total of 3,214 cases commenced, and 3,403 for the fiscal year 1929; 189 more cases were commenced in 1929 than were commenced in 1926.

There was a total of 4,616 cases commenced in the northern district, 5,181 in the eastern district, and 3,807 in the western district during the period. More cases were commenced in the eastern district than in either of the other two districts of the State.

At the end of the fiscal year 1926 there was a total of 2,232 cases pending in all three districts of the State. At the end of the fiscal year 1929 there was a total of 2,466 cases pending, an increase of 234 cases. At the end of the fiscal year 1929 there was a total of 83 cases pending in the northern district, 619 in the eastern district, and 1,016 in the western district.

Oklahoma ranks tenth among the States of the Union in the number of cases commenced during the period.

It is believed that the business conducted in the Federal courts of the State of Oklahoma is sufficient to warrant an additional judge who would be appointed to serve in all three districts.

MISSOURI

There were 1,052 civil cases, 3,131 private cases, and 7,494 criminal cases, a total of 11,677 cases commenced in the State of Missouri for the period.

Of all the cases commenced, 63 per cent were criminal cases. Of all the criminal cases commenced, 4,935, or 65 per cent, were prohibition cases.

For the fiscal year 1926 there was a total of 2,690 cases commenced, while for the fiscal year 1929 there was a total of 3,295 cases commenced, an increase for 1929 over 1926 of 605 cases.

There was a total of 5,866 cases commenced in the eastern district and a total of 5,811 cases commenced in the western district during the period.

At the end of the fiscal year 1926 there was a total of 1,770 cases pending in both districts, while at the end of the fiscal year 1929 there was a total of 1,979 cases pending in both districts, an increase for 1929 over 1926 of 209 cases.

At the end of the fiscal year 1929 there was a total of 780 cases pending in the eastern district and 1,199 cases pending in the western district.

Missouri ranks twelfth among the States of the Union in the number of cases commenced. There are two Federal districts in the State, with two judges for each district. It is believed that the business transacted in the Federal courts of the State warrants an additional judge to serve in both districts.

WASHINGTON

The State of Washington has two Federal districts with one judge in the eastern district and two judges in the western district.

There were 1,428 civil, 962 private, and 4,223 criminal, a total of 6,613 cases commenced in the State of Washington during the 4-year period.

Of all the cases commenced 63 per cent were criminal cases. Of the criminal cases commenced 3,151, or 47 per cent, were prohibition cases.

For the fiscal year ending 1926 there was a total of 1,789 cases commenced, while for the fiscal year 1929 there was a total of 1,666 cases commenced, a decrease of 123 cases.

There was a total of 5,476 cases, or 82 per cent of all the cases commenced, commenced in the western district. The work has been so heavy in this district that it has been necessary to have outside assistance.

During the fiscal year 1926 there was a total of 1,058 cases pending in the State, 890 of which were pending in the western district. At the end of the fiscal year 1929 there was a total of 1,003 cases pending in the State, 816 of which were pending in the western district.

The western district of Washington ranks 26th in the number of cases commenced in all the 85 districts of the United States.

It is believed that because of the large number of cases commenced in this district that an additional judge should be provided for the western district of Washington.

GEORGIA

In the State of Georgia there are three Federal districts with a judge in each district.

During the period there were 1,563 civil, 1,202 private, and 8,603 criminal, a total of 11,368 cases commenced in the State.

Of all the cases commenced, 75 per cent were criminal. Of the criminal cases commenced, 6,861 or 79 per cent were prohibition cases.

For the fiscal year 1926 there was a total of 2,241 cases commenced in the State, while for the fiscal year 1929, there was a total of 2,868, an increase of 627 cases commenced.

There was a total of 5,627 cases commenced in the northern district of Georgia during the period, and a total of 5,741 cases commenced in the other two districts combined. In other words there were as many cases commenced in the northern district as were commenced in both the middle and southern districts put together.

During the fiscal year 1926 there was a total of 3,976 cases pending in the State, 2,028 of which were pending in the northern district, while at the end of the fiscal year 1929, there was a total of 2,755 cases pending in the State, with 1,724 or 62 per cent pending in the northern district. At the end of the fiscal year 1929 there were 693 more cases pending in the northern district alone than in the other two districts combined.

The northern district of Georgia ranks twenty-fourth in the number of cases commenced. It is believed that because of the large number of cases pending in the northern district an additional judge should be provided for that district.

LOUISIANA

In the State of Louisiana, with two Federal districts and a judge for each district, 1,187 civil, 858 private, and 5,244 criminal, a total of 7,289 cases, were commenced during the period.

Of all the cases commenced 71 per cent were criminal cases. Of the criminal cases commenced 3,906, or 74 per cent, were prohibition cases.

For the fiscal year 1926 there was a total of 1,491 cases commenced, while for the fiscal year 1929 there was a total of 1,925 cases commenced, an increase of 434 cases for the year 1929 over 1926.

Of the total cases commenced in the State 5,717, or 78 per cent, were commenced in the eastern district.

During the fiscal year 1926 there was a total of 1,062 cases pending in the State, 844, or 79 per cent, of which were pending in the eastern district. At the end of the fiscal year 1929 there was a total of 542 cases pending in the State, 419, or 77 per cent, of which were pending in the eastern district.

The eastern district of Louisiana ranks twenty-third in the number of cases commenced.

It is believed because of the large number of cases in the eastern district that an additional judge should be provided for that district.

TEXAS

In the State of Texas during the 4-year period there were 2,044 civil, 3,227 private, and 15,246 criminal cases, a total of 20,517 cases commenced.

Of all the cases commenced 74 per cent were criminal cases. Of the criminal cases commenced 9,362, or 61 per cent, were prohibition cases.

For the fiscal year 1926 there was a total of 4,013 cases commenced, while for the fiscal year 1929 there was a total of 5,006 cases commenced, an increase for the year 1929 over 1926 of 993 cases.

The congestion in the State of Texas is in the southern district. There is only one judge in the southern district and there were 5,333 cases commenced in that district alone during

the 4-year period, while there were 6,087 cases commenced in the northern district with three judges, and 6,901 cases commenced in the western district with two judges.

For the year 1926 there was a total of 1,693 cases pending in the State, 470, or 27 per cent, of which were pending in the southern district. At the end of the fiscal year 1929 there was a total of 1,612 cases pending in the State, 473, or 29 per cent, of which were pending in the southern district.

The southern district of Texas ranks twenty-eighth in the number of cases commenced.

There are at present four Federal districts in the State. Three judges preside in the northern district, 1 in the eastern, 1 in the southern, and 2 in the western district, a total of 7 Federal judges for the State.

It is believed that because of the volume of business commenced in the southern district of Texas, an additional judge should be provided.

MICHIGAN

During the 4-year period there were 3,991 civil, 1,443 private, and 7,814 criminal, a total of 13,248 cases commenced in the State of Michigan.

Of all the cases commenced, 55 per cent were criminal cases. Of the criminal cases commenced, 5,053, or 64 per cent, were prohibition cases.

For the fiscal year 1926 there was a total of 2,586 cases commenced, while for the fiscal year 1929 there was a total of 3,862 cases commenced, an increase for the year 1929 over the year 1926 of 1,276 cases commenced.

The congestion in the State of Michigan is in the eastern district. Of a total of 13,248 cases commenced in the State, 11,553, or 87 per cent, were commenced in the eastern district. There was a total of 2,198 cases commenced in this district in the fiscal year 1926, while in the fiscal year 1929, 3,376 cases were commenced, an increase over 1926 of 1,178 cases commenced.

At the end of the fiscal year 1926 there was a total of 1,084 cases pending in the State, 883, or 81 per cent, of which were pending in the eastern district. At the end of the fiscal year 1929 there were 1,696 cases pending in the State, 1,577, or 93 per cent of which were pending in the eastern district. There was an increase of 694 in the number of pending cases at the end of the fiscal year 1929 over 1926 in the eastern district.

The eastern district of Michigan ranks eighth in the number of cases commenced.

At present there are two Federal districts in Michigan, with 3 judges in the eastern district and 2 judges in the western district, a total of 5 judges for the State.

Because of the large increase in the number of cases commenced in the eastern district, as well as the large increase in the number of pending cases, it is believed that an additional judge should be provided for the district.

FIFTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

At present there are three circuit judges of the fifth circuit court of appeals. The circuit includes the States of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas, and the Canal Zone, and composes 17 Federal districts, with 22 district courts. Last year there were 271 cases to be disposed of by the three judges in the circuit. The conference of senior circuit judges last October held that this was too many cases and recommended an additional judge for the circuit.

Hon. Richard W. Walker, senior judge of the circuit recently requested an additional circuit judge saying that an "additional judge is urgently needed."

Because of the excessive number of cases in the circuit, it is believed that an additional judge should be provided for the fifth circuit court of appeals.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BACHMANN. I yield.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The gentleman has spent weeks and weeks in the preparation of the information which he is now giving to the House. Some of the Members are anxious to get a complete and comprehensive idea of the information. Will the gentleman continue with his statement and yield to interruptions after he has completed?

Mr. BACHMANN. I am afraid I can not complete it in the time I have.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BACHMANN. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I suggest that we would not need any more Federal judges if the House would do the wise thing and repeal the Jones law and repeal the eighteenth amendment.

Mr. BACHMANN. I can not agree with my friend from Wisconsin on that question, because additional judges in some districts would still be required because of the heavy civil and private litigation pending in those courts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BACHMANN] has expired.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BACHMANN] may proceed for 15 additional minutes, without interruption.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BACHMANN] may proceed for 15 additional minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BACHMANN] not finish in five minutes?

Mr. BACHMANN. I can by eliminating part of my prepared remarks.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. May we not compromise on 10 minutes?

Mr. RANKIN. I will compromise with the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] once, and consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BACHMANN] may proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] has been modified to extend the time of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BACHMANN] for 10 additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL DISTRICT JUDGES

Mr. BACHMANN. There are now 85 Federal judicial districts in the United States, not including Alaska, Hawaii, and Porto Rico, with 148 presiding judges. During the fiscal year 1929 there was a total of 128,185 cases commenced in combined districts. Had it been possible to dispose of this number of cases in the fiscal year, each of the 148 district judges would have had to hear 866 cases, or an average of almost 3 cases per day.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BACHMANN. Yes.

Mr. COX. I take it from what the gentleman says that it is his judgment that the prohibition cases are responsible for the congested condition in the Federal courts.

Mr. BACHMANN. Not necessarily. The progress that we have made in this country and the changing economic and social conditions is such that the Federal judiciary has been unable to keep pace with those changing conditions, and in some of these States, not only prohibition cases but other criminal cases, civil cases, and private litigation are responsible for the congestion.

Mr. COX. Since most of the States have prohibition laws that are quite as severe as the Federal law, and since there is a determination in most of the States to enforce those laws with equal severity, if not greater than the enforcement of the Federal law in the Federal courts, I am wondering whether the gentleman has given any thought to the question as to what relief might be obtained from this congested condition if the Federal officers would use the machinery for such cases provided by the States? In other words, take the cases into the State courts.

Mr. BACHMANN. That would be in part a good solution of the question, but the tendency, as I understand it, is for a good many of the Federal officers in the enforcement of the prohibition law to take cases from the State courts and transfer them into the Federal courts.

Mr. COX. That is true, but that practice, as I take it, is gradually being abandoned.

NEEDED LEGISLATION

Mr. BACHMANN. I have heretofore called attention to the fact that the President has recommended to the Congress that legislation of considerable importance should be enacted to relieve the congestion existing in the Federal courts in order that the law of the land may be properly enforced.

Up until this time no legislation of this character has been enacted.

The burden of enforcing the law is upon the President, and unless the Congress will enact legislation which will enable him to properly enforce the law, his program for law enforcement can not proceed as it should.

Mr. PALMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BACHMANN. Yes.

Mr. PALMER. The gentleman says we must enact certain laws. Does not the gentleman realize we already have plenty of machinery and all that is necessary is to have it put into motion to enforce the law.

Mr. BACHMANN. I do not realize we have plenty of machinery in the Federal courts at the present time to relieve the situation. I recognize just to the contrary, that our Federal judiciary has not progressed as the economic and social conditions of the country have progressed. We have outgrown our Federal judiciary. The President says the same thing and the Attorney

General says the same thing. The Commission on Law Observance says the same thing.

Mr. PALMER. I think we have adequate laws if we had officers who would go to work and enforce the laws.

Mr. BACHMANN. The number of arrests made does not necessarily mean that the law is being enforced. There must be adequate courts in which violators of the law may be punished. If there are not sufficient courts to try the cases and impose punishment, the law of the land can not be properly enforced.

There can be no doubt that due to the congestion existing in some of the district courts the law is not being properly enforced; and if the Congress refuses to enact legislation to relieve the situation certainly it will be grossly unfair to criticize the President, when, as a matter of fact, the Congress itself is at fault.

Legislation for the appointment of additional judges involves no constitutional controversy.

In a country whose population is rapidly increasing, whose social and economic conditions are continually advancing, it is only a natural sequence that litigation in the Federal courts must necessarily increase, and therefore the machinery of the courts must be adequate to cope with existing and changing conditions.

I am firmly of the opinion that proper relief from existing conditions in the Federal courts can be provided if Congress will enact legislation for the appointment of additional judges, as follows:

A circuit judge for the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Two judges for the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia.

One judge for the northern judicial district of New York.

Two judges for the southern judicial district of New York.

One judge for the eastern judicial district of New York.

One judge for the western judicial district of New York.

One judge for the western judicial district of Washington.

One judge for the northern judicial district of Georgia.

One judge for the eastern judicial district of Louisiana.

One judge for the southern judicial district of Texas.

One judge for the eastern judicial district of Michigan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has again expired.

Mrs. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have one additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia may proceed for one additional minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BACHMANN. One judge for the two Federal judicial districts of Missouri.

One judge for the two Federal judicial districts of California.

One judge for the three Federal judicial districts of Oklahoma.

And the creation of a new Federal judicial district with one judge in the State of West Virginia.

And the creation of a new Federal judicial district in the State of Kentucky.

I will say to the Members of the House that following my remarks they will find the figures for each State in the Union for the fiscal years 1926, 1927, 1928, and 1929, the cases commenced, the cases terminated, the cases pending as well as the population in each State. [Applause.]

State	District	Cases commenced, beginning fiscal year 1926; ending fiscal year 1929			Cases terminated, beginning fiscal year 1926; ending fiscal year 1929			Cases pending, fiscal year 1926			Cases pending, fiscal year 1929			Number of district judges
		Civil and private	Criminal	Total	Civil and private	Criminal	Total	Civil and private	Criminal	Total	Civil and private	Criminal	Total	
Alabama	Northern	817	1,916	2,733	932	2,107	3,039	177	346	523	125	176	301	1
Do.	Middle	252	517	769	254	591	845	67	149	216	88	31	119	1
Do.	Southern	266	1,128	1,394	273	1,223	1,496	87	155	242	75	116	191	1
Total		1,335	3,561	4,896	1,459	3,921	5,390	331	650	981	288	323	611	
Arizona		662	3,313	3,975	587	3,179	3,766	234	257	491	266	377	643	2
Arkansas	Eastern	951	2,952	3,903	793	3,001	3,794	210	249	459	326	173	499	1
Do.	Western	762	1,215	1,977	807	1,486	2,293	166	393	559	140	166	306	1
Total		1,713	4,167	5,880	1,600	4,487	6,087	376	642	1,018	466	339	805	
California	Northern	3,873	5,084	8,957	4,805	6,201	11,006	1,063	665	1,728	956	374	1,330	3
Do.	Southern	2,703	2,853	5,556	2,339	3,297	5,636	854	878	1,732	1,162	477	1,639	3
Total		6,576	7,937	14,513	7,144	9,498	16,642	1,917	1,543	3,460	2,118	851	2,969	
Colorado		1,136	1,341	2,477	1,069	1,362	2,431	302	158	460	332	222	554	1
Connecticut		569	532	1,101	809	562	1,371	368	46	414	137	16	153	2
Delaware		424	358	782	405	401	806	149	30	179	183	7	190	1
District of Columbia		16,556	49,187	65,743	15,142	48,126	63,268	3,203	3,945	7,148	4,339	3,076	7,415	7
Florida	Northern	194	777	971	172	830	1,002	114	149	263	107	115	222	1
Do.	Southern	4,816	3,511	8,327	4,041	3,414	7,455	827	1,177	2,004	1,562	1,042	2,604	3
Total		5,010	4,288	9,298	4,213	4,244	8,457	941	1,326	2,267	1,669	1,157	2,826	
Georgia	Northern	1,497	4,130	5,627	1,657	4,593	6,250	433	1,595	2,028	334	1,390	1,724	1
Do.	Middle	564	2,273	2,837	632	2,961	3,593	None.	None.	None.	137	275	468	1
Do.	Southern	704	2,200	2,904	770	2,575	3,345	358	1,590	1,948	193	426	563	1
Total		2,765	8,603	11,368	3,059	10,129	13,188	791	3,185	3,976	664	2,091	2,755	
Idaho		631	1,602	2,233	721	1,634	2,355	302	215	517	197	142	339	1
Illinois	Northern	7,066	6,106	13,172	6,780	5,731	12,511	1,473	400	1,873	1,576	898	2,474	3
Do.	Eastern	1,423	2,092	3,515	1,397	2,117	3,514	268	112	380	282	88	370	2
Do.	Southern	1,351	1,845	3,196	1,191	1,694	2,885	293	115	408	455	392	847	1
Total		9,840	10,043	19,883	9,368	9,542	18,910	2,034	627	2,661	2,313	1,378	3,691	
Indiana	Northern	1,026	997	2,023	847	837	1,684	289	168	457	394	213	607	1
Do.	Southern	807	1,014	1,821	991	1,072	2,063				197	125	322	1
Total		1,833	2,011	3,844	1,838	1,909	3,747	289	168	457	591	338	929	
Iowa	Northern	697	852	1,549	917	973	1,890	182	156	338	87	38	125	1
Do.	Southern	618	921	1,539	717	1,002	1,719	237	125	362	154	65	219	2
Total		1,315	1,773	3,088	1,634	1,975	3,609	419	281	700	241	103	344	
Kansas		1,816	730	2,546	1,684	791	2,475	605	187	792	731	124	855	2
Kentucky	Eastern	1,746	12,080	13,826	1,963	12,556	14,519	497	549	1,046	354	415	769	1
Do.	Western	833	4,014	4,847	860	5,004	5,864	351	702	1,053	311	99	410	1
Total		2,579	16,094	18,673	2,823	17,560	20,383	848	1,251	2,099	665	514	1,179	
Louisiana	Eastern	1,658	4,059	5,717	2,230	5,028	7,258	683	161	844	355	64	419	1
Do.	Western	387	1,185	1,572	413	1,326	1,739	161	57	218	90	33	123	1
Total		2,045	5,244	7,289	2,643	6,354	8,997	844	218	1,062	445	97	542	

State	District	Cases commenced, beginning fiscal year 1928; ending fiscal year 1929			Cases terminated, beginning fiscal year 1928; ending fiscal year 1929			Cases pending, fiscal year 1928			Cases pending, fiscal year 1929			Number of district judges
		Civil and private	Criminal	Total	Civil and private	Criminal	Total	Civil and private	Criminal	Total	Civil and private	Criminal	Total	
Maine		453	882	1,335	589	894	1,483	225	83	309	116	88	204	1
Maryland		2,375	5,582	7,957	3,002	6,078	9,080	607	1,044	1,651	317	246	563	2
Massachusetts		3,699	2,507	6,206	3,790	2,586	6,376	1,463	336	1,799	1,311	290	1,601	3
Michigan	Eastern	4,775	6,778	11,553	4,362	6,876	11,238	556	327	883	1,167	410	1,577	3
Do	Western	659	1,036	1,695	687	1,116	1,803	132	69	201	94	25	119	2
Total		5,434	7,814	13,248	5,049	7,992	13,041	688	396	1,084	1,261	435	1,696	
Minnesota		4,458	4,611	9,069	3,491	4,482	7,973	960	264	1,224	1,885	516	2,401	3
Mississippi	Northern	543	1,609	2,152	530	1,608	2,138	63	152	215	82	177	259	1
Do	Southern	966	1,311	2,277	695	1,399	2,094	419	160	579	181	100	281	1
Total		1,509	2,920	4,429	1,225	3,007	4,232	482	312	794	263	277	540	
Missouri	Eastern	1,725	4,140	5,866	1,671	4,080	5,751	500	278	778	502	278	780	2
Do	Western	2,457	3,354	5,811	2,182	3,467	5,649	691	301	992	891	308	1,199	2
Total		4,182	7,494	11,677	3,853	7,547	11,400	1,191	579	1,770	1,393	586	1,979	
Montana		2,267	3,186	5,453	1,859	2,859	4,718	337	193	530	758	488	1,246	2
Nebraska		1,514	2,247	3,761	1,475	2,245	3,720	532	315	847	590	353	943	2
Nevada		412	1,124	1,536	492	1,238	1,730	257	334	591	114	102	216	1
New Hampshire		502	1,295	1,797	515	1,288	1,803	42	24	66	33	26	59	1
New Jersey		6,273	3,238	9,511	6,253	3,053	11,306	2,444	1,080	3,474	2,133	1,029	3,162	4
New Mexico		418	1,319	1,737	469	1,350	1,819	120	68	188	80	55	135	1
New York	Northern	2,728	8,572	11,300	2,466	8,837	11,303	1,319	1,244	2,563	1,458	914	2,372	2
Do	Eastern	10,558	9,527	20,085	9,067	11,935	21,002	8,949	3,708	12,657	8,803	1,098	9,901	5
Do	Southern	14,893	23,384	38,277	15,899	25,425	41,324	9,093	2,077	11,170	8,406	2,948	11,354	8
Do	Western	2,344	6,413	8,757	2,162	6,038	8,200	827	2,101	2,928	917	1,855	2,772	2
Total		30,523	47,896	78,419	29,594	52,235	81,829	20,188	9,130	29,318	19,584	6,815	26,399	
North Carolina	Eastern	906	2,489	3,395	1,055	2,564	3,619	421	206	627	258	165	423	1
Do	Middle	649	1,849	2,498	510	1,383	1,893		None		139	466	605	1
Do	Western	1,187	3,336	4,523	1,144	3,945	5,089	411	1,063	1,474	372	422	794	2
Total		2,742	7,674	10,416	2,709	7,892	10,601	832	1,269	2,101	769	1,053	1,822	
North Dakota		593	528	1,121	661	526	1,187	163	171	334	115	177	292	1
Ohio	Northern	5,549	4,709	10,258	5,479	4,832	10,311	1,007	568	1,575	1,166	496	1,662	3
Do	Southern	2,158	1,938	4,096	1,850	1,821	3,671	453	91	544	731	225	956	2
Total		7,707	6,647	14,354	7,329	6,653	13,982	1,460	659	2,119	1,897	721	2,618	
Oklahoma	Northern	1,225	3,391	4,616	1,077	3,005	4,082	254	342	596	283	548	831	1
Do	Eastern	1,283	3,893	5,181	1,346	4,064	5,410	286	493	779	337	282	619	1
Do	Western	1,181	2,626	3,807	997	2,540	3,537	285	572	857	415	601	1,016	1
Total		3,694	9,910	13,604	3,420	9,609	13,029	825	1,407	2,232	1,035	1,431	2,466	
Oregon		1,231	1,569	2,800	1,245	1,756	3,001	405	269	674	280	127	407	2
Pennsylvania	Eastern	4,107	2,274	6,381	4,119	2,622	6,741	2,435	615	3,050	2,316	343	2,659	3
Do	Middle	748	1,842	2,590	812	2,987	3,799	315	169	484	250	99	349	2
Do	Western	6,134	5,769	11,903	6,590	5,766	12,356	1,843	400	2,243	1,690	396	2,086	3
Total		10,989	9,885	20,874	11,521	11,375	22,896	4,593	1,184	5,777	4,256	838	5,094	
Rhode Island		166	336	502	205	364	569	216	98	314	111	75	186	1
South Carolina	Eastern	835	1,413	2,248	855	1,356	2,211	196	535	731	189	680	869	2
Do	Western	488	1,376	1,864	493	1,445	1,938	102	140	242	87	112	199	1
Total		1,323	2,789	4,112	1,348	2,801	4,149	298	675	973	276	792	1,068	
South Dakota		535	1,173	1,708	623	1,198	1,821	373	367	740	210	177	387	2
Tennessee	Eastern	899	3,376	4,275	845	3,503	4,348	164	391	555	253	204	457	1
Do	Middle	540	2,672	3,212	574	2,572	3,146	137	382	519	160	619	779	1
Do	Western	489	1,141	1,630	474	1,338	1,812	135	70	205	141	56	197	1
Total		1,928	7,189	9,117	1,893	7,413	9,306	436	843	1,279	554	879	1,433	
Texas	Northern	1,886	4,201	6,087	1,921	4,227	6,148	382	188	570	388	205	593	3
Do	Eastern	818	1,378	2,196	866	1,421	2,287	162	60	222	132	45	177	1
Do	Southern	1,469	3,864	5,333	1,534	3,948	5,482	312	158	470	282	191	473	1
Do	Western	1,098	5,803	6,901	1,143	5,904	7,047	190	241	431	207	162	369	2
Total		5,271	15,246	20,517	5,464	15,500	20,964	1,046	647	1,693	1,009	603	1,612	
Utah		428	562	990	455	596	1,051	101	75	176	72	71	143	1
Vermont		249	825	1,074	248	839	1,087	92	104	196	86	116	202	1
Virginia	Eastern	964	1,325	2,289	1,236	1,382	2,618	248	138	386	174	118	292	1
Do	Western	620	1,254	1,874	618	1,531	2,149	95	127	222	95	127	222	1
Total		1,584	2,579	4,163	1,854	2,913	4,767	343	265	608	269	245	514	
Washington	Eastern	399	738	1,137	371	745	1,116	107	61	168	129	58	187	1
Do	Western	1,991	3,485	5,476	1,889	3,729	5,618	376	514	890	570	246	816	2
Total		2,390	4,223	6,613	2,260	4,474	6,734	483	575	1,058	699	304	1,003	
West Virginia	Northern	744	2,852	3,596	686	3,084	3,770	200	265	465	260	100	360	1
Do	Southern	1,846	9,737	11,583	1,819	9,541	11,360	360	820	1,180	334	782	1,116	1
Total		2,590	12,589	15,179	2,505	12,625	15,130	560	1,085	1,645	594	882	1,476	
Wisconsin	Eastern	1,059	1,265	2,324	1,027	1,117	2,144	181	74	255	196	231	427	1
Do	Western	493	918	1,411	447	872	1,319	133	133	266	175	162	337	1
Total		1,552	2,183	3,735	1,474	1,989	3,463	314	207	521	371	393	764	
Wyoming		88	124	212	83	121	204	124	28	152	76	33	109	1

Total number of cases commenced by States, beginning fiscal year 1926, ending fiscal year 1929

Number of districts	Number of judges	Civil and private cases		Criminal cases		Total all cases	
		State	Cases	State	Cases	State	Cases
4	17	1 New York	30,523	1 District of Columbia	49,187	1 New York	78,419
3	7	2 District of Columbia	16,556	2 New York	47,896	2 District of Columbia	65,743
3	8	3 Pennsylvania	10,989	3 Kentucky	16,094	3 Pennsylvania	20,874
3	6	4 Illinois	9,840	4 Texas	15,246	4 Texas	20,517
2	5	5 Ohio	7,707	5 West Virginia	12,589	5 Illinois	19,883
2	6	6 California	6,576	6 Illinois	10,043	6 Kentucky	18,673
1	4	7 New Jersey	6,273	7 Oklahoma	9,910	7 West Virginia	15,179
2	5	8 Michigan	5,434	8 Pennsylvania	9,885	8 California	14,513
4	7	9 Texas	5,271	9 Georgia	8,603	9 Ohio	14,354
2	4	10 Florida	5,010	10 California	7,937	10 Oklahoma	13,604
1	3	11 Minnesota	4,458	11 Michigan	7,814	11 Michigan	13,248
2	4	12 Missouri	4,183	12 North Carolina	7,674	12 Missouri	11,677
1	3	13 Massachusetts	3,699	13 Missouri	7,494	13 Georgia	11,368
3	3	14 Oklahoma	3,694	14 Tennessee	7,189	14 North Carolina	10,416
3	3	15 Georgia	2,765	15 Ohio	6,647	15 New Jersey	9,511
3	4	16 North Carolina	2,742	16 Maryland	5,582	16 Florida	9,298
2	2	17 West Virginia	2,590	17 Louisiana	5,244	17 Tennessee	9,117
2	2	18 Kentucky	2,579	18 Minnesota	4,611	18 Minnesota	9,069
2	3	19 Washington	2,390	19 Florida	4,288	19 Maryland	7,957
1	2	20 Maryland	2,375	20 Washington	4,223	20 Louisiana	7,289
2	2	21 Montana	2,267	21 Arkansas	4,167	21 Washington	6,613
2	2	22 Louisiana	2,045	22 Alabama	3,561	22 Massachusetts	6,206
3	3	23 Tennessee	1,923	23 Arizona	3,313	23 Arkansas	5,880
2	2	24 Indiana	1,833	24 New Jersey	3,235	24 Montana	5,453
1	2	25 Kansas	1,816	25 Montana	3,186	25 Alabama	4,896
2	2	26 Arkansas	1,713	26 Mississippi	2,920	26 Mississippi	4,429
2	2	27 Virginia	1,684	27 South Carolina	2,789	27 Virginia	4,163
1	2	28 Wisconsin	1,532	28 Virginia	2,579	28 South Carolina	4,112
2	2	29 Nebraska	1,514	29 Massachusetts	2,507	29 Arizona	3,975
2	2	30 Mississippi	1,509	30 Nebraska	2,247	30 Indiana	3,844
3	3	31 Alabama	1,335	31 Wisconsin	2,183	31 Nebraska	3,761
2	3	32 South Carolina	1,323	32 Indiana	2,011	32 Wisconsin	3,735
2	3	33 Iowa	1,315	33 Iowa	1,773	33 Iowa	3,088
1	2	34 Oregon	1,231	34 Idaho	1,602	34 Oregon	2,804
1	1	35 Colorado	1,136	35 Oregon	1,569	35 Kansas	2,546
1	1	36 Arizona	662	36 Colorado	1,341	36 Colorado	2,477
1	1	37 Idaho	631	37 New Mexico	1,319	37 Idaho	2,233
1	1	38 North Dakota	593	38 New Hampshire	1,295	38 New Hampshire	1,797
1	1	39 Connecticut	569	39 South Dakota	1,173	39 New Mexico	1,737
1	1	40 South Dakota	535	40 Nevada	1,124	40 South Dakota	1,708
1	1	41 New Hampshire	502	41 Nevada	882	41 Nevada	1,536
1	1	42 Maine	453	42 Vermont	825	42 Maine	1,335
1	1	43 Utah	428	43 Kansas	730	43 North Dakota	1,121
1	1	44 Delaware	424	44 Utah	562	44 Connecticut	1,101
1	1	45 New Mexico	418	45 Connecticut	532	45 Vermont	1,074
1	1	46 Nevada	412	46 North Dakota	528	46 Utah	990
1	1	47 Vermont	249	47 Delaware	358	47 Delaware	782
1	1	48 Rhode Island	166	48 Rhode Island	336	48 Rhode Island	502
1	1	49 Wyoming	88	49 Wyoming	124	49 Wyoming	212
		Total	165,885	Total	298,930	Total	464,815

Total number of all cases terminated by States, beginning fiscal year 1926, ending fiscal year 1929

	State	Cases
1	New York	81,829
2	District of Columbia	63,268
3	Pennsylvania	22,896
4	Texas	20,964
5	Kentucky	20,383
6	Illinois	18,910
7	California	16,642
8	West Virginia	15,130
9	Ohio	13,982
10	Georgia	13,188
11	Michigan	13,041
12	Oklahoma	13,023
13	Missouri	11,400
14	New Jersey	11,306
15	North Carolina	10,601
16	Tennessee	9,306
17	Maryland	9,080
18	Louisiana	8,997
19	Florida	8,457
20	Minnesota	7,973
21	Washington	6,734
22	Massachusetts	6,376
23	Arkansas	6,087
24	Alabama	6,390
25	Virginia	4,767
26	Montana	4,718
27	Mississippi	4,232
28	South Carolina	4,149
29	Arizona	3,796
30	Maryland	3,747
31	Nebraska	3,720
32	Iowa	3,609
33	Wisconsin	3,463
34	Oregon	3,001
35	Kansas	2,475
36	Colorado	2,431
37	Idaho	2,355
38	South Dakota	1,821
39	New Mexico	1,819
40	New Hampshire	1,803
41	Nevada	1,730
42	Maine	1,483
43	Connecticut	1,371
44	North Dakota	1,187

Total number of all cases terminated by States, beginning fiscal year 1926, ending fiscal year 1929—Continued

	State	Cases
45	Vermont	1,087
46	Utah	1,051
47	Delaware	806
48	Rhode Island	569
49	Wyoming	204
Total		476,333

Total number of all cases pending, by States

	State	Fiscal year 1926	Fiscal year 1929
1	Alabama	981	611
2	Arizona	491	643
3	Arkansas	1,018	805
4	California	3,460	2,969
5	Colorado	460	554
6	Connecticut	414	153
7	Delaware	179	190
8	District of Columbia	7,148	7,415
9	Florida	2,267	2,826
10	Georgia	3,976	2,755
11	Idaho	517	339
12	Illinois	2,661	3,691
13	Indiana	457	929
14	Iowa	700	344
15	Kansas	792	855
16	Kentucky	2,099	1,179
17	Louisiana	1,062	542
18	Maine	309	204
19	Maryland	1,651	563
20	Massachusetts	1,799	1,601
21	Michigan	1,084	1,696
22	Minnesota	1,224	2,401
23	Mississippi	794	540
24	Missouri	1,770	1,979
25	Montana	530	1,246
26	Nebraska	847	943
27	Nevada	501	216
28	New Hampshire	66	59

Total number of all cases pending, by States—Continued

	State	Fiscal year 1926	Fiscal year 1929
29	New Jersey	3,474	3,162
30	New Mexico	188	135
31	New York	29,318	26,399
32	North Carolina	2,101	1,822
33	North Dakota	334	292
34	Ohio	2,119	2,618
35	Oklahoma	2,232	2,466
36	Oregon	674	407
37	Pennsylvania	5,777	5,094
38	Rhode Island	314	186
39	South Carolina	973	1,068
40	South Dakota	740	387

Total number of all cases pending, by States—Continued

	State	Fiscal year 1926	Fiscal year 1929
41	Tennessee	1,279	1,433
42	Texas	1,693	1,612
43	Utah	176	143
44	Vermont	196	202
45	Virginia	608	514
46	Washington	1,058	1,003
47	West Virginia	1,645	1,476
48	Wisconsin	521	764
49	Wyoming	152	109
Total		94,919	89,540

Number of all civil and private cases commenced, by districts, for the period beginning with the fiscal year 1926 and ending with the fiscal year 1929

State	District	Cases
1. District of Columbia		16,536
2. New York	S	14,893
3. Do.	E	10,558
4. Illinois	N	7,066
5. New Jersey		6,273
6. Pennsylvania	W	6,134
7. Ohio	N	5,549
8. Florida	S	4,816
9. Michigan	E	4,775
10. Minnesota		4,458
11. Pennsylvania	E	4,107
12. California	N	3,873
13. Massachusetts		3,699
14. New York	N	2,728
15. California	S	2,703
16. Missouri	W	2,457
17. Maryland		2,375
18. New York	W	2,344
19. Montana		2,267
20. Ohio	S	2,158
21. Washington	W	1,991
22. Texas	N	1,886
23. West Virginia	S	1,846
24. Kansas		1,816
25. Kentucky	E	1,746
26. Missouri	E	1,726
27. Louisiana	E	1,658
28. Nebraska		1,514
29. Georgia	N	1,497
30. Texas	S	1,469
31. Illinois	E	1,423
32. Illinois	S	1,351
33. Oklahoma	E	1,288
34. Oregon		1,231
35. Oklahoma	N	1,225
36. North Carolina	W	1,187
37. Oklahoma	W	1,181
38. Colorado		1,136
39. Texas	W	1,098
40. Wisconsin	E	1,059
41. Indiana	N	1,026
42. Mississippi	S	966
43. Virginia	E	964
44. Arkansas	E	951
45. North Carolina	E	906
46. Tennessee	E	899
47. South Carolina	E	835
48. Kentucky	W	833
49. Texas	E	818
50. Alabama	N	817
51. Indiana	S	807
52. Arkansas	W	762
53. Pennsylvania	M	748
54. West Virginia	N	744
55. Georgia	S	704
56. Iowa	N	697
57. Arizona		662
58. Michigan	W	659
59. North Carolina	M	649
60. Idaho		631
61. Virginia	W	620
62. Iowa	S	618
63. North Dakota		593
64. Connecticut		569
65. Georgia	M	564
66. Mississippi	N	543
67. Tennessee	M	540
68. South Dakota		535
69. New Hampshire		502
70. Wisconsin	W	493
71. Tennessee	W	489
72. South Carolina	W	488
73. Maine		463
74. Utah		428
75. Delaware		424
76. New Mexico		418
77. Nevada		412
78. Washington	E	399
79. Louisiana	W	387
80. Alabama	S	266
81. Alabama	M	252
82. Vermont		249
83. Florida	N	194
84. Rhode Island		166
85. Wyoming		88
Total		165,885

Number of all criminal cases commenced, by districts, for the period beginning with the fiscal year 1926 and ending with the fiscal year 1929

State	District	Cases
1. District of Columbia		49,187
2. New York	S	23,384
3. Kentucky	E	12,080
4. West Virginia	S	9,737
5. New York	E	9,527
6. Do.	N	8,572
7. Michigan	E	6,778
8. New York	W	6,413
9. Illinois	N	6,106
10. Texas	W	5,803
11. Pennsylvania	W	5,769
12. Maryland		5,582
13. California	N	5,084
14. Ohio	N	4,709
15. Minnesota		4,611
16. Texas	N	4,201
17. Missouri	E	4,140
18. Georgia	N	4,130
19. Louisiana	W	4,059
20. Kentucky	E	4,014
21. Oklahoma	E	3,893
22. Texas	S	3,864
23. Florida	W	3,511
24. Washington	N	3,485
25. Oklahoma	E	3,391
26. Tennessee	E	3,376
27. Missouri	W	3,354
28. North Carolina	W	3,336
29. Arizona		3,313
30. New Jersey		3,238
31. Montana	E	3,186
32. Arkansas	S	2,952
33. California	N	2,853
34. West Virginia	M	2,852
35. Tennessee	W	2,672
36. Oklahoma	W	2,626
37. Massachusetts	E	2,607
38. North Carolina	E	2,489
39. Pennsylvania	E	2,274
40. Georgia	M	2,273
41. Nebraska	S	2,247
42. Georgia	S	2,200
43. Illinois	E	2,092
44. Ohio	S	1,938
45. Alabama	N	1,916
46. North Carolina	M	1,849
47. Illinois	S	1,845
48. Pennsylvania	M	1,842
49. Mississippi	N	1,609
50. Idaho		1,602
51. Oregon		1,569
52. South Carolina	E	1,413
53. Texas	E	1,378
54. South Carolina	W	1,376
55. Colorado		1,341
56. Virginia	E	1,325
57. New Mexico		1,319
58. Mississippi	S	1,311
59. New Hampshire	W	1,295
60. Wisconsin	W	1,265
61. Virginia	W	1,254
62. Arkansas	W	1,215
63. Louisiana	W	1,185
64. South Dakota	W	1,173
65. Tennessee	W	1,141
66. Alabama	S	1,128
67. Nevada		1,124
68. Michigan	W	1,036
69. Indiana	S	1,014
70. Do.	N	997
71. Iowa	S	921
72. Wisconsin	W	918
73. Maine		882
74. Iowa	N	852
75. Vermont		825
76. Florida	N	777
77. Washington	E	738
78. Kansas		730
79. Utah		562
80. Connecticut		532
81. North Dakota		528
82. Alabama	M	517
83. Delaware		358
84. Rhode Island		336
85. Wyoming		124
Total		298,930

Total number of all cases commenced, by districts, for the period beginning with the fiscal year 1926 and ending with the fiscal year 1929

State	District	Cases
1. District of Columbia		65,743
2. New York	S	38,277
3. Do.	E	20,085
4. Kentucky	E	13,826
5. Illinois	N	13,172
6. Pennsylvania	W	11,903
7. West Virginia	S	11,583
8. Michigan	E	11,553
9. New York	N	11,300
10. Ohio	N	10,258
11. New Jersey		9,511
12. Minnesota		9,069
13. California	N	8,957
14. New York	W	8,757
15. Florida	S	8,327
16. Maryland		7,957
17. Texas	W	6,901
18. Pennsylvania	E	6,381
19. Massachusetts		6,206
20. Texas	N	6,087
21. Missouri	E	5,866
22. Missouri	W	5,811
23. Louisiana	E	5,717
24. Georgia	N	5,627
25. California	S	5,556
26. Washington	W	5,476
27. Montana		5,453
28. Texas	S	5,333
29. Oklahoma	E	5,181
30. Kentucky	W	4,847
31. Oklahoma		4,616
32. North Carolina	W	4,523
33. Tennessee	E	4,275
34. Ohio	S	4,096
35. Arizona		3,975
36. Arkansas	E	3,903
37. Oklahoma	W	3,807
38. Nebraska		3,761
39. West Virginia	N	3,596
40. Illinois	E	3,515
41. North Carolina	E	3,396
42. Tennessee	M	3,212
43. Illinois	S	3,196
44. Georgia	S	2,904
45. Do.	M	2,837
46. Oregon		2,800
47. Alabama	N	2,733
48. Pennsylvania	M	2,590
49. Kansas		2,546
50. North Carolina	M	2,498
51. Colorado		2,477
52. Wisconsin	E	2,324
53. Virginia	E	2,280
54. Mississippi	S	2,277
55. South Carolina	E	2,248
56. Idaho		2,233
57. Texas	E	2,196
58. Mississippi	N	2,152
59. Indiana	N	2,023
60. Arkansas	W	1,977
61. Virginia	W	1,874
62. South Carolina	W	1,864
63. Indiana	S	1,821
64. New Hampshire		1,797
65. New Mexico		1,737
66. South Dakota		1,708
67. Michigan	W	1,695
68. Tennessee	W	1,630
69. Louisiana	W	1,572
70. Iowa	N	1,549
71. Iowa	S	1,539
72. Nevada		1,536
73. Wisconsin	W	1,411
74. Alabama	S	1,394
75. Maine		1,335
76. Washington	E	1,137
77. North Dakota		1,121
78. Connecticut		1,101
79. Vermont		1,074
80. Utah		990
81. Florida	N	971
82. Delaware		782
83. Alabama	M	769
84. Rhode Island		502
85. Wyoming		212
Total		464,815

Total number of all cases terminated, by districts, beginning fiscal year 1926, ending fiscal year 1929

State	District	Cases
1. District of Columbia		63,268
2. New York	S.	41,324
3. Do.	E.	21,002
4. Kentucky	E.	14,519
5. Illinois	N.	12,511
6. Pennsylvania	W.	12,356
7. West Virginia	S.	11,360
8. New Jersey		11,306
9. New York	N.	11,303
10. Michigan	E.	11,238
11. California	N.	11,006
12. Ohio	N.	10,311
13. Maryland		9,080
14. New York	W.	8,200
15. Minnesota		7,973
16. Florida	S.	7,455
17. Louisiana	E.	7,258
18. Texas	W.	7,047
19. Pennsylvania	E.	6,741
20. Massachusetts		6,376
21. Georgia	N.	6,250
22. Texas	N.	6,148
23. Kentucky	W.	5,864
24. Missouri	E.	5,751
25. Do.	W.	5,649
26. California	S.	5,636
27. Washington	W.	5,618
28. Texas	S.	5,482
29. Oklahoma	E.	5,410
30. North Carolina	W.	5,089
31. Montana		4,718
32. Tennessee	E.	4,348
33. Oklahoma	N.	4,082
34. Pennsylvania	M.	3,799
35. Arkansas	E.	3,794
36. West Virginia	N.	3,770
37. Arizona		3,766
38. Nebraska		3,720
39. Ohio	S.	3,671
40. North Carolina	E.	3,619
41. Georgia	M.	3,593
42. Oklahoma	W.	3,537
43. Illinois	E.	3,514
44. Georgia	S.	3,345

Total number of all cases terminated, by districts, beginning fiscal year 1926, ending fiscal year 1929—Continued

State	District	Cases
45. Tennessee	M.	3,146
46. Alabama	N.	3,039
47. Oregon		3,001
48. Illinois	S.	2,885
49. Virginia	E.	2,618
50. Kansas		2,475
51. Colorado		2,431
52. Idaho		2,355
53. Arkansas	W.	2,293
54. Texas	E.	2,287
55. South Carolina	E.	2,211
56. Virginia	W.	2,149
57. Wisconsin	E.	2,144
58. Mississippi	N.	2,138
59. Do.	S.	2,094
60. Indiana	S.	2,063
61. South Carolina	W.	1,938
62. North Carolina	M.	1,893
63. Iowa	N.	1,890
64. South Dakota		1,821
65. New Mexico		1,819
66. Tennessee	W.	1,812
67. Michigan	W.	1,803
68. New Hampshire		1,803
69. Louisiana	W.	1,739
70. Nevada		1,730
71. Iowa	S.	1,719
72. Indiana	N.	1,684
73. Alabama	S.	1,496
74. Maine		1,483
75. Connecticut		1,371
76. Wisconsin	W.	1,319
77. North Dakota		1,187
78. Washington	E.	1,116
79. Vermont		1,087
80. Utah		1,051
81. Florida	N.	1,002
82. Alabama	M.	855
83. Delaware		806
84. Rhode Island		569
85. Wyoming		204
Total		476,333

Total number of all civil and private cases pending, by districts, at the end of the fiscal year 1929

State	District	Cases
1. New York	Eastern	8,803
2. Do.	Southern	8,406
3. District of Columbia		4,339
4. Pennsylvania	Eastern	2,316
5. New Jersey		2,133
6. Minnesota		1,885
7. Pennsylvania	Western	1,690
8. Illinois	Northern	1,576
9. Florida	Southern	1,562
10. New York	Northern	1,458
11. Massachusetts		1,311
12. Michigan	Eastern	1,167
13. Ohio	Northern	1,166
14. California	Southern	1,162
15. Do.	Northern	956
16. New York	Western	917
17. Missouri	do	891
18. Montana		758
19. Kansas		731
20. Ohio	Southern	731
21. Nebraska		590
22. Washington	Western	570
23. Missouri	Eastern	502
24. Illinois	Southern	455
25. Oklahoma	Western	415
26. Indiana	Northern	394
27. Texas	Northern	388
28. North Carolina	Western	372
29. Louisiana	Eastern	355
30. Kentucky	Eastern	354
31. Oklahoma	Eastern	337
32. Georgia	Northern	334
33. West Virginia	Southern	334
34. Colorado		332
35. Arkansas	Eastern	326
36. Maryland		317
37. Kentucky	Western	311
38. Oklahoma	Northern	283
39. Illinois	Eastern	282
40. Texas	Southern	282
41. Oregon		280
42. Arizona		266
43. West Virginia	Northern	260
44. North Carolina	Eastern	258
45. Tennessee	do	253
46. Pennsylvania	Middle	250
47. South Dakota		210
48. Texas	Western	207
49. Idaho		197
50. Indiana	Southern	197
51. Wisconsin	Eastern	196
52. Georgia	Middle	193

Total number of all criminal cases pending, by districts, at the end of the fiscal year 1929

State	District	Cases
1. District of Columbia		3,076
2. New York	Southern	2,948
3. Do.	Western	1,855
4. Georgia	Northern	1,390
5. New York	Eastern	1,098
6. Florida	Southern	1,042
7. New Jersey		1,029
8. New York	Northern	914
9. Illinois	do	898
10. West Virginia	Southern	782
11. North Carolina	Eastern	680
12. Tennessee	Middle	619
13. Oklahoma	Western	601
14. Do.	Northern	548
15. Minnesota		516
16. Ohio	Northern	496
17. Montana		488
18. California	Southern	477
19. North Carolina	Middle	466
20. Georgia	Southern	426
21. North Carolina	Western	422
22. Kentucky	Eastern	415
23. Michigan	do	410
24. Pennsylvania	Western	396
25. Illinois	Southern	392
26. Arizona		377
27. California	Northern	374
28. Nebraska		353
29. Pennsylvania	Eastern	343
30. Missouri	Western	308
31. Massachusetts		290
32. Oklahoma	Eastern	282
33. Missouri	Eastern	278
34. Georgia	Middle	275
35. Maryland		246
36. Washington	Western	246
37. Wisconsin	Eastern	231
38. Ohio	Southern	225
39. Colorado		222
40. Indiana	Northern	213
41. Texas	Northern	205
42. Tennessee	Eastern	204
43. Texas	Southern	191
44. Mississippi	Northern	177
45. North Dakota		177
46. South Dakota		177
47. Alabama	Northern	176
48. Arkansas	Eastern	173
49. Do.	Western	166
50. North Carolina	Eastern	165
51. Texas	Western	162
52. Wisconsin	do	162

Total number of all cases pending, by districts, at the end of the fiscal year 1929

State	District	Cases
1. New York	Southern	11,354
2. Do.	Eastern	9,901
3. District of Columbia		7,415
4. New Jersey		3,162
5. New York	Western	2,772
6. Pennsylvania	Eastern	2,659
7. Florida	Southern	2,604
8. Illinois	Northern	2,474
9. Minnesota		2,401
10. New York	Northern	2,372
11. Pennsylvania	Western	2,086
12. Georgia	Northern	1,724
13. Ohio	do	1,662
14. California	Southern	1,639
15. Massachusetts		1,601
16. Michigan	Eastern	1,577
17. California	Northern	1,330
18. Montana		1,246
19. Missouri	Western	1,199
20. West Virginia	Southern	1,116
21. Oklahoma	Western	1,016
22. Ohio	Southern	956
23. Nebraska		943
24. South Carolina	Eastern	869
25. Kansas		855
26. Illinois	Southern	847
27. Oklahoma	Northern	831
28. Washington	Western	816
29. North Carolina	Western	794
30. Missouri	Eastern	780
31. Tennessee	Middle	779
32. Kentucky	Eastern	769
33. Arizona		643
34. Oklahoma	Eastern	619
35. Indiana	Northern	607
36. North Carolina	Middle	605
37. Texas	Northern	593
38. Georgia	Southern	563
39. Maryland		563
40. Colorado		554
41. Arkansas	Eastern	499
42. Texas	Southern	473
43. Georgia	Middle	468
44. Tennessee	Eastern	457
45. Wisconsin	do	427
46. North Carolina	do	423
47. Louisiana	do	419
48. Kentucky	Western	410
49. Oregon		407
50. South Dakota		387
51. Illinois	Eastern	370
52. Texas	Western	369

Total number of all civil and private cases pending, by districts, at the end of the fiscal year 1929—Continued

Total number of all criminal cases pending, by districts, at the end of the fiscal year 1929—Continued

Total number of all cases pending, by districts, at the end of the fiscal year 1929—Continued

State	District	Cases	State	District	Cases	State	District	Cases
53. South Carolina	Eastern	189	53. Idaho		142	53. West Virginia	Northern	360
54. Delaware		183	54. Oregon		127	54. Pennsylvania	Middle	349
55. Mississippi	Southern	181	55. Virginia	Western	127	55. Idaho		339
56. Wisconsin	Western	175	56. Indiana	Southern	125	56. Wisconsin	Western	337
57. Virginia	Eastern	174	57. Kansas		124	57. Indiana	Southern	322
58. Tennessee	Middle	160	58. Virginia	Eastern	118	58. Arkansas	Western	306
59. Iowa	Southern	154	59. Alabama	Southern	116	59. Alabama	Northern	301
60. Tennessee	Western	141	60. Vermont		116	60. North Dakota		292
61. Arkansas	do	140	61. Florida	Northern	115	61. Virginia	Eastern	292
62. North Carolina	Middle	139	62. South Carolina	Western	112	62. Mississippi	Southern	281
63. Connecticut		137	63. Nevada		102	63. Do	Northern	259
64. Georgia	Southern	137	64. Mississippi	Southern	100	64. Florida	do	222
65. Texas	Eastern	132	65. West Virginia	Northern	100	65. Virginia	Western	222
66. Washington	do	129	66. Kentucky	Western	99	66. Iowa	Southern	219
67. Alabama	Northern	125	67. Pennsylvania	Middle	99	67. Nevada		216
68. Maine		116	68. Illinois	Eastern	88	68. Maine		204
69. North Dakota		115	69. Maine		88	69. Vermont		202
70. Nevada		114	70. Rhode Island		75	70. South Carolina	Western	199
71. Rhode Island		111	71. Utah		71	71. Tennessee	do	197
72. Florida	Northern	107	72. Iowa	Southern	65	72. Alabama	Southern	191
73. Virginia	Western	95	73. Louisiana	Eastern	64	73. Delaware		190
74. Michigan	do	94	74. Washington	do	58	74. Washington	Eastern	187
75. Louisiana	do	90	75. Tennessee	Western	56	75. Rhode Island		186
76. Alabama	Middle	88	76. New Mexico		55	76. Texas	Eastern	177
77. Iowa	Northern	87	77. Texas	Eastern	45	77. Connecticut		153
78. South Carolina	Western	86	78. Louisiana	Northern	38	78. Utah		143
79. Vermont		82	79. Wyoming	Western	33	79. New Mexico		135
80. Mississippi	Northern	80	80. Iowa	Middle	33	80. Iowa	Northern	125
81. New Mexico		76	81. Louisiana		31	81. Louisiana	Western	123
82. Wyoming		76	82. Alabama		26	82. Alabama	Middle	119
83. Alabama	Southern	75	83. Michigan	Western	25	83. Michigan	Western	119
84. Utah		72	84. Connecticut		16	84. Wyoming		109
85. New Hampshire		33	85. Delaware		7	85. New Hampshire		59
Total		58,162	Total		31,378	Total		89,540

Business transacted in Federal courts of each State for the period beginning fiscal year 1926 and ending fiscal year 1929

ALABAMA

Population, 1920:	
Northern district	1,225,082
Middle district	693,359
Southern district	429,733
Total	2,348,174

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES COMMENCED						
N	Civil	72	50	55	49	226
	Private	124	166	160	141	591
	Criminal	638	385	451	442	1,916
	Total for district	834	601	666	632	2,733
M	Civil	21	22	31	20	94
	Private	34	34	21	69	158
	Criminal	236	66	128	87	517
	Total for district	291	122	180	176	769
S	Civil	21	34	27	36	118
	Private	40	35	37	36	148
	Criminal	183	257	371	317	1,128
	Total for district	244	326	435	389	1,394
	Total for State	1,369	1,049	1,281	1,197	4,896
CASES TERMINATED						
N	Civil	74	80	64	49	267
	Private	185	156	161	163	665
	Criminal	810	402	465	430	2,107
	Total for district	1,069	638	690	642	3,039
M	Civil	42	24	32	16	114
	Private	45	29	29	47	150
	Criminal	232	90	102	167	591
	Total for district	319	143	163	230	855
S	Civil	30	26	23	37	116
	Private	26	47	46	38	157
	Criminal	239	295	342	347	1,223
	Total for district	295	368	411	422	1,496
	Total for State	1,683	1,149	1,264	1,294	5,390

Business transacted in Federal courts of each State for the period beginning fiscal year 1926 and ending fiscal year 1929—Continued

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES PENDING						
N	Civil	68	38	29	29	
	Private	109	119	118	96	
	Criminal	346	322	164	176	
	Total for district	523	479	311	301	
M	Civil	18	16	15	20	
	Private	49	54	46	68	
	Criminal	149	125	151	31	
	Total for district	216	195	212	119	
S	Civil	25	33	37	36	
	Private	62	50	41	39	
	Criminal	155	117	146	116	
	Total for district	242	200	224	191	
	Total for State	981	874	747	611	

ARIZONA

Population, 1920 334,162

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES COMMENCED						
	Civil	83	55	24	146	308
	Private	110	82	84	78	354
	Criminal	940	759	684	930	3,313
	Total for State	1,133	896	792	1,154	3,975
CASES TERMINATED						
	Civil	57	80	25	94	256
	Private	93	89	82	67	331
	Criminal	927	657	789	806	3,179
	Total for State	1,077	826	896	967	3,766
CASES PENDING						
	Civil	119	94	93	145	
	Private	115	108	110	121	
	Criminal	257	358	253	377	
	Total for State	491	560	456	643	

Business transacted in Federal courts of each State for the period beginning fiscal year 1926 and ending fiscal year 1929—Continued

ARKANSAS

Population, 1920:
 Eastern district..... 1,158,661
 Western district..... 593,543
 Total..... 1,752,204

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES COMMENCED						
E	Civil.....	28	27	11	125	191
	Private.....	184	203	219	154	760
	Criminal.....	749	871	570	762	2,952
	Total for district.....	961	1,101	800	1,041	3,903
W	Civil.....	42	22	42	55	161
	Private.....	127	159	144	171	601
	Criminal.....	320	197	340	358	1,215
	Total for district.....	489	378	526	584	1,977
CASES TERMINATED						
E	Civil.....	15	35	13	23	86
	Private.....	151	189	182	185	707
	Criminal.....	713	827	665	796	3,001
	Total for district.....	879	1,051	860	1,004	3,794
W	Civil.....	46	35	48	23	152
	Private.....	142	159	179	175	655
	Criminal.....	365	248	521	352	1,486
	Total for district.....	553	442	748	550	2,293
CASES PENDING						
E	Civil.....	24	20	18	120	282
	Private.....	186	200	237	206	829
	Criminal.....	249	303	207	173	932
	Total for district.....	459	523	462	499	1,943
W	Civil.....	36	23	17	49	125
	Private.....	130	130	95	91	446
	Criminal.....	393	342	160	166	1,051
	Total for district.....	559	495	272	306	1,632
Total for State.....						
		1,018	1,018	734	805	3,575

CALIFORNIA

Population, 1920:
 Northern district..... 1,746,646
 Southern district..... 1,680,215
 Total..... 3,426,861

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES COMMENCED						
N	Civil.....	550	401	847	548	2,346
	Private.....	339	312	410	466	1,527
	Criminal.....	1,165	1,123	1,200	1,596	5,084
	Total for district.....	2,054	1,836	2,457	2,610	8,957
S	Civil.....	243	235	340	325	1,143
	Private.....	317	414	420	409	1,560
	Criminal.....	759	744	719	631	2,853
	Total for district.....	1,319	1,393	1,479	1,365	5,556
CASES TERMINATED						
N	Civil.....	508	544	645	654	2,351
	Private.....	1,206	388	393	467	2,454
	Criminal.....	1,988	1,233	1,137	1,843	6,201
	Total for district.....	3,702	2,165	2,175	2,964	11,006
S	Civil.....	197	232	279	224	932
	Private.....	307	316	383	401	1,407
	Criminal.....	802	1,183	684	628	3,297
	Total for district.....	1,306	1,731	1,346	1,253	5,636
CASES PENDING						
N	Civil.....	516	373	575	469	1,933
	Private.....	547	471	488	487	1,993
	Criminal.....	665	555	621	374	2,155
	Total for district.....	1,728	1,399	1,684	1,330	6,141
Total for State.....						
		3,746	3,235	4,141	4,165	15,327

Business transacted in Federal courts of each State for the period beginning fiscal year 1926 and ending fiscal year 1929—Continued

COLORADO

Population, 1920..... 339,629

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES COMMENCED						
S	Civil.....	104	114	107	146	471
	Private.....	175	240	136	114	665
	Criminal.....	357	250	420	314	1,341
	Total for State.....	636	604	663	574	2,477
CASES TERMINATED						
S	Civil.....	107	86	130	95	418
	Private.....	126	198	202	125	651
	Criminal.....	442	240	364	316	1,362
	Total for State.....	675	524	696	536	2,431
CASES PENDING						
S	Civil.....	85	113	90	141	429
	Private.....	217	259	202	191	869
	Criminal.....	158	168	224	222	772
	Total for State.....	460	540	516	554	2,070
Total for State.....						
		1,101	1,144	1,279	1,128	4,902

CONNECTICUT

Population, 1920..... 1,380,621

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES COMMENCED						
S	Civil.....	86	73	59	58	276
	Private.....	55	73	89	76	293
	Criminal.....	109	98	151	174	532
	Total for State.....	250	244	299	308	1,101
CASES TERMINATED						
S	Civil.....	89	120	68	68	345
	Private.....	61	85	99	219	464
	Criminal.....	109	97	163	193	562
	Total for State.....	259	302	330	480	1,371
CASES PENDING						
S	Civil.....	95	48	39	29	211
	Private.....	273	261	251	108	893
	Criminal.....	46	47	35	16	144
	Total for State.....	414	356	325	153	1,248
Total for State.....						
		673	600	624	641	2,538

DELAWARE

Population, 1920..... 223,003

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES COMMENCED						
S	Civil.....	32	25	21	19	97
	Private.....	42	83	123	79	327
	Criminal.....	75	79	127	77	358
	Total for State.....	149	187	271	175	782
CASES TERMINATED						
S	Civil.....	44	18	24	32	118
	Private.....	45	63	126	53	287
	Criminal.....	95	55	166	85	401
	Total for State.....	184	136	316	170	806
CASES PENDING						
S	Civil.....	27	34	31	18	110
	Private.....	122	142	139	165	578
	Criminal.....	30	54	15	7	106
	Total for State.....	179	230	185	190	684
Total for State.....						
		323	417	501	365	1,606

Business transacted in Federal courts of each State for the period beginning fiscal year 1926 and ending fiscal year 1929—Continued

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Population, 1920..... 437,571

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES COMMENCED						
Civil.....		366	172	254	235	1,027
Private.....		3,461	3,750	4,358	3,960	15,529
Criminal.....		10,588	11,983	13,378	13,238	49,187
Total.....		14,415	15,905	17,990	17,433	65,743
CASES TERMINATED						
Civil.....		325	325	151	169	970
Private.....		3,120	3,848	3,664	3,540	14,172
Criminal.....		10,036	12,412	13,465	12,213	48,126
Total.....		13,481	16,585	17,280	15,922	63,268
CASES PENDING						
Civil.....		431	382	485	551	-----
Private.....		2,772	2,674	3,368	3,788	-----
Criminal.....		3,945	2,148	2,071	3,076	-----
Total.....		7,148	5,204	5,924	7,415	-----

FLORIDA

Population, 1920:
 Northern district..... 291,243
 Southern district..... 677,227
 Total..... 968,470

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES COMMENCED						
N.....	Civil.....	3	2	6	15	26
	Private.....	55	32	42	89	168
	Criminal.....	127	210	227	213	777
	Total for district.....	185	244	275	267	971
S.....	Civil.....	148	289	513	794	1,744
	Private.....	507	718	856	991	3,072
	Criminal.....	838	559	1,007	1,107	3,511
	Total for district.....	1,493	1,566	2,376	2,892	8,327
	Total for State.....	1,678	1,810	2,651	3,159	9,298
CASES TERMINATED						
N.....	Civil.....	1	9	2	16	28
	Private.....	36	56	21	31	144
	Criminal.....	146	232	242	210	830
	Total for district.....	183	297	285	257	1,002
S.....	Civil.....	235	179	356	730	1,500
	Private.....	325	576	668	972	2,541
	Criminal.....	606	829	660	1,319	3,414
	Total for district.....	1,166	1,584	1,684	3,021	7,455
	Total for State.....	1,349	1,881	1,949	3,278	8,457
CASES PENDING						
N.....	Civil.....	19	12	16	11	-----
	Private.....	95	67	88	96	-----
	Criminal.....	149	127	112	115	-----
	Total for district.....	263	206	216	222	-----
S.....	Civil.....	176	286	443	507	-----
	Private.....	651	793	1,034	1,055	-----
	Criminal.....	1,177	907	1,254	1,042	-----
	Total for district.....	2,004	1,986	2,731	2,604	-----
	Total for State.....	2,267	2,192	2,947	2,826	-----

GEORGIA

Population, 1920:
 Northern district..... 1,380,350
 Southern district..... 1,515,482
 Total..... 2,895,832

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES COMMENCED						
N.....	Civil.....	258	83	345	252	938
	Private.....	164	151	121	123	559
	Criminal.....	743	756	1,075	1,556	4,130
	Total for district.....	1,165	990	1,541	1,931	5,627

Business transacted in Federal courts of each State for the period beginning fiscal year 1926 and ending fiscal year 1929—Continued

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES COMMENCED—contd.						
M.....	Civil (middle district not created until 1927).....	-----	73	60	104	237
	Private.....	-----	109	111	107	327
	Criminal.....	-----	412	880	981	2,273
	Total for district.....	-----	594	1,051	1,192	2,837
S.....	Civil.....	93	64	96	135	388
	Private.....	118	61	52	85	316
	Criminal.....	865	331	479	525	2,200
	Total for district.....	1,076	456	627	745	2,904
	Total for State.....	2,241	2,040	3,219	2,868	11,368
CASES TERMINATED						
N.....	Civil.....	272	273	254	281	1,080
	Private.....	211	104	150	112	577
	Criminal.....	1,001	916	1,323	1,353	4,593
	Total for district.....	1,484	1,293	1,727	1,746	6,250
M.....	Civil (middle district not created until 1927).....	-----	67	123	107	297
	Private.....	-----	120	104	111	335
	Criminal.....	-----	723	1,298	940	2,961
	Total for district.....	-----	910	1,525	1,158	3,593
S.....	Civil.....	100	66	125	156	447
	Private.....	133	61	69	60	322
	Criminal.....	648	483	649	795	2,575
	Total for district.....	881	610	843	1,011	3,345
	Total for State.....	2,365	2,813	4,095	3,915	13,188
CASES PENDING						
N.....	Civil.....	316	126	217	188	-----
	Private.....	117	164	135	146	-----
	Criminal.....	1,595	1,435	1,187	1,390	-----
	Total for district.....	2,028	1,725	1,539	1,724	-----
M.....	Civil (middle district not created until 1927).....	-----	118	55	52	-----
	Private.....	-----	138	145	141	-----
	Criminal.....	-----	652	234	275	-----
	Total for district.....	-----	908	434	468	-----
S.....	Civil.....	159	91	63	45	-----
	Private.....	199	87	70	92	-----
	Criminal.....	1,590	880	696	426	-----
	Total for district.....	1,948	1,058	829	563	-----
	Total for State.....	3,976	3,691	2,802	2,755	-----

IDAHO

Population, 1920..... 431,866

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES COMMENCED						
	Civil.....	105	20	38	117	280
	Private.....	123	68	81	79	351
	Criminal.....	422	374	385	421	1,602
	Total for State.....	650	462	504	617	2,233
CASES TERMINATED						
	Civil.....	96	67	50	39	252
	Private.....	115	143	99	107	469
	Criminal.....	377	408	409	440	1,634
	Total for State.....	588	623	558	586	2,355
CASES PENDING						
	Civil.....	91	44	34	112	-----
	Private.....	211	131	113	85	-----
	Criminal.....	215	186	161	142	-----
	Total for State.....	517	361	308	339	-----

ILLINOIS

Population, 1920:
 Northern district..... 3,824,178
 Eastern district..... 1,250,590
 Southern district..... 1,410,542
 Total..... 6,485,310

Business transacted in Federal courts of each State for the period beginning fiscal year 1926 and ending fiscal year 1929—Continued

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES COMMENCED						
N.....	Civil.....	1,183	1,218	1,249	954	4,604
	Private.....	491	621	729	621	2,462
	Criminal.....	927	1,098	1,786	2,295	6,106
	Total for district.....	2,601	2,937	3,764	3,870	13,172
E.....	Civil.....	115	216	294	437	1,062
	Private.....	101	83	72	105	361
	Criminal.....	408	499	480	705	2,092
	Total for district.....	624	798	846	1,247	3,515
S.....	Civil.....	192	220	179	309	900
	Private.....	81	86	154	130	451
	Criminal.....	398	495	331	621	1,845
	Total for district.....	671	801	664	1,060	3,196
	Total for State.....	3,896	4,536	5,274	6,177	19,883
CASES TERMINATED						
N.....	Civil.....	1,074	1,381	866	1,161	4,482
	Private.....	507	510	699	582	2,298
	Criminal.....	1,051	789	1,608	2,283	5,731
	Total for district.....	2,632	2,680	3,173	4,026	12,511
E.....	Civil.....	111	232	281	400	1,024
	Private.....	63	93	84	103	373
	Criminal.....	409	513	482	713	2,117
	Total for district.....	613	838	847	1,216	3,514
S.....	Civil.....	194	197	208	257	856
	Private.....	81	44	117	93	335
	Criminal.....	524	325	412	433	1,694
	Total for district.....	799	566	737	783	2,885
	Total for State.....	4,044	4,084	4,757	6,025	18,910
CASES PENDING						
N.....	Civil.....	564	401	784	577	
	Private.....	909	1,020	960	999	
	Criminal.....	400	709	887	898	
	Total for district.....	1,873	2,130	2,631	2,474	
E.....	Civil.....	78	62	75	112	
	Private.....	190	180	168	170	
	Criminal.....	112	98	96	88	
	Total for district.....	380	340	339	370	
S.....	Civil.....	129	152	123	175	
	Private.....	164	206	243	280	
	Criminal.....	115	285	204	392	
	Total for district.....	408	643	570	847	
	Total for State.....	2,661	3,113	3,540	3,691	

INDIANA

Population, 1920:
 Northern district..... 1,063,910
 Southern district..... 1,866,480
 Total..... 2,930,390

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES COMMENCED						
N.....	Civil.....	123	139	34	158	454
	Private.....	222	224	13	113	572
	Criminal.....	285	279	113	320	997
	Total for district.....	630	642	160	591	2,023
S.....	Civil (new district created in 1928).....			330	91	421
	Private.....			252	134	386
	Criminal.....			623	391	1,014
	Total for district.....			1,205	616	1,821
	Total for State.....	630	642	1,365	1,207	3,844
CASES TERMINATED						
N.....	Civil.....	108	93	3	149	353
	Private.....	230	178	16	70	494
	Criminal.....	277	264	13	283	837
	Total for district.....	615	535	32	502	1,684

Business transacted in Federal courts of each State for the period beginning fiscal year 1926 and ending fiscal year 1929—Continued

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES TERMINATED—contd.						
S.....	Civil (new district created in 1928).....			383	98	481
	Private.....			211	299	510
	Criminal.....			691	381	1,072
	Total for district.....			1,285	778	2,063
	Total for State.....	615	535	1,317	1,280	3,747
CASES PENDING						
N.....	Civil.....	74	120	119	129	
	Private.....	215	261	221	265	
	Criminal.....	168	183	175	213	
	Total for district.....	457	564	515	607	
S.....	Civil (new district created in 1928).....			67	60	
	Private.....			302	137	
	Criminal.....			115	125	
	Total for district.....			484	322	
	Total for State.....	457	564	999	929	

IOWA

Population, 1920:
 Northern district..... 1,159,797
 Southern district..... 1,244,224
 Total..... 2,404,021

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES COMMENCED						
N.....	Civil.....	49	15	21	25	110
	Private.....	143	158	167	119	587
	Criminal.....	204	259	255	134	852
	Total for district.....	396	432	443	278	1,549
S.....	Civil.....	17	33	27	24	101
	Private.....	139	147	126	105	517
	Criminal.....	275	213	225	208	921
	Total for district.....	431	393	378	337	1,539
	Total for State.....	827	825	821	615	3,088
CASES TERMINATED						
N.....	Civil.....	48	18	26	27	119
	Private.....	273	159	205	161	798
	Criminal.....	207	304	294	168	973
	Total for district.....	528	481	525	356	1,890
S.....	Civil.....	15	24	32	43	114
	Private.....	157	125	158	163	603
	Criminal.....	294	201	261	246	1,002
	Total for district.....	466	350	451	452	1,719
	Total for State.....	994	831	976	808	3,609
CASES PENDING						
N.....	Civil.....	18	15	10	8	
	Private.....	164	158	120	79	
	Criminal.....	156	111	72	38	
	Total for district.....	338	284	202	125	
S.....	Civil.....	40	49	44	25	
	Private.....	197	219	187	129	
	Criminal.....	125	138	102	65	
	Total for district.....	362	406	333	219	
	Total for State.....	700	690	535	344	

KANSAS

Population 1920..... 1,769,257

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES COMMENCED						
	Civil.....	103	110	111	124	448
	Private.....	308	281	510	269	1,368
	Criminal.....	148	206	207	169	730
	Total for State.....	559	697	828	562	2,546

Business transacted in Federal courts of each State for the period beginning fiscal year 1926 and ending fiscal year 1929—Continued

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
	CASES TERMINATED					
	Civil.....	110	88	132	85	415
	Private.....	295	337	349	288	1,269
	Criminal.....	146	206	242	197	791
	Total for State.....	551	631	723	570	2,475
	CASES PENDING					
	Civil.....	74	96	75	114	359
	Private.....	531	475	636	617	2,259
	Criminal.....	187	187	152	124	650
	Total for State.....	792	758	863	855	3,208

KENTUCKY

Population, 1920:	
Eastern district	1,226,383
Western district	1,190,247
Total	2,416,630

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES COMMENCED						
E	Civil	308	206	317	256	1,087
	Private	185	189	160	125	659
	Criminal	2,703	2,293	3,363	3,721	12,080
	Total for district	3,196	2,688	3,840	4,102	13,826
W	Civil	68	62	112	82	324
	Private	119	164	123	103	509
	Criminal	1,514	716	872	912	4,014
	Total for district	1,701	942	1,107	1,097	4,847
	Total for State	4,897	3,630	4,947	5,199	18,673
CASES TERMINATED						
E	Civil	322	332	278	280	1,212
	Private	248	140	187	176	751
	Criminal	3,045	1,790	3,984	3,737	12,556
	Total for district	3,615	2,262	4,449	4,193	14,519
W	Civil	100	87	94	89	370
	Private	80	143	130	137	490
	Criminal	1,901	1,194	975	934	5,004
	Total for district	2,081	1,424	1,199	1,160	5,864
	Total for State	5,696	3,686	5,648	5,353	20,383
CASES PENDING						
E	Civil	236	110	149	125	620
	Private	261	310	280	229	1,080
	Criminal	549	1,052	431	415	2,447
	Total for district	1,046	1,472	860	769	4,147
W	Civil	117	92	109	102	420
	Private	234	255	242	209	940
	Criminal	702	224	121	99	1,156
	Total for district	1,053	571	472	410	2,506
	Total for State	2,099	2,043	1,332	1,179	6,653

LOUISIANA

Population, 1920:	
Eastern district	853,85
Western district	944,64
Total	1,798,509

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES COMMENCED						
E	Civil	270	137	162	457	1,026
	Private	166	212	132	122	632
	Criminal	663	1,109	1,273	1,014	4,059
	Total for district	1,099	1,458	1,567	1,593	5,717
W	Civil	39	36	38	48	161
	Private	42	93	42	49	236
	Criminal	311	298	371	235	1,215
	Total for district	392	397	451	332	1,572
	Total for State	1,491	1,855	2,018	1,925	7,289

Business transacted in Federal courts of each State for the period beginning fiscal year 1926 and ending fiscal year 1929—Continued

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES TERMINATED						
E	Civil	358	214	188	383	1,143
	Private	322	383	258	124	1,087
	Criminal	1,535	1,214	1,305	974	5,028
	Total for district	2,215	1,811	1,751	1,481	7,258
W	Civil	44	40	44	40	168
	Private	34	80	53	78	245
	Criminal	428	258	390	250	1,326
	Total for district	506	378	487	368	1,739
	Total for State	2,721	2,189	2,238	1,849	8,997
CASES PENDING						
E	Civil	168	91	65	139	463
	Private	515	344	218	216	1,313
	Criminal	161	56	24	64	305
	Total for district	844	491	307	419	1,661
W	Civil	17	13	7	15	52
	Private	144	115	104	75	438
	Criminal	57	67	48	33	205
	Total for district	218	195	159	123	695
	Total for State	1,062	686	466	542	2,753

MAINE

Population, 1920	768,014
------------------	---------

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES COMMENCED						
	Civil	57	49	68	81	255
	Private	44	66	42	46	198
	Criminal	253	151	209	269	882
	Total for State	354	266	319	396	1,335
CASES TERMINATED						
	Civil	65	55	57	69	246
	Private	62	182	42	57	343
	Criminal	270	137	237	250	894
	Total for State	397	374	336	376	1,483
CASES PENDING						
	Civil	24	18	29	41	112
	Private	202	86	86	75	449
	Criminal	83	97	69	88	337
	Total for State	309	201	184	204	904

MARYLAND

Population, 1920	768,014
------------------	---------

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES COMMENCED						
	Civil	484	327	350	423	1,584
	Private	239	253	170	129	791
	Criminal	1,558	1,167	1,507	1,350	5,582
	Total for State	2,281	1,747	2,027	1,902	7,957
CASES TERMINATED						
	Civil	502	380	371	440	1,693
	Private	557	366	198	188	1,309
	Criminal	1,256	1,124	2,166	1,532	6,078
	Total for State	2,315	1,870	2,735	2,160	9,080
CASES PENDING						
	Civil	262	209	188	171	830
	Private	345	233	205	146	929
	Criminal	1,044	1,087	428	246	3,805
	Total for State	1,651	1,529	821	563	4,564

Business transacted in Federal courts of each State for the period beginning fiscal year 1926 and ending fiscal year 1929—Continued

MASSACHUSETTS

Population, 1920..... 3,852,356

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
	CASES COMMENCED					
	Civil.....	435	405	424	775	2,039
	Private.....	462	402	414	382	1,660
	Criminal.....	624	671	633	579	2,507
	Total for State.....	1,521	1,478	1,471	1,736	6,206
	CASES TERMINATED					
	Civil.....	459	402	517	373	1,751
	Private.....	377	384	737	541	2,039
	Criminal.....	657	580	620	729	2,586
	Total for State.....	1,493	1,366	1,874	1,643	6,376
	CASES PENDING					
	Civil.....	446	449	356	758	-----
	Private.....	1,017	1,035	712	553	-----
	Criminal.....	336	427	440	290	-----
	Total for State.....	1,799	1,911	1,508	1,601	-----

MICHIGAN

Population, 1920:
Eastern district..... 2,387,125
Western district..... 1,211,699

Total..... 3,598,794

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
	CASES COMMENCED					
E.....	Civil.....	688	800	949	1,241	3,678
	Private.....	149	252	392	304	1,097
	Criminal.....	1,361	1,706	1,880	1,831	6,778
	Total for district.....	2,198	2,758	3,221	3,376	11,553
W.....	Civil.....	48	49	80	136	313
	Private.....	68	102	100	76	346
	Criminal.....	272	224	266	274	1,036
	Total for district.....	388	375	446	486	1,695
	Total for State.....	2,586	3,133	3,667	3,862	13,248
	CASES TERMINATED					
E.....	Civil.....	786	723	779	1,050	3,338
	Private.....	256	148	295	325	1,024
	Criminal.....	1,510	1,687	1,879	1,800	6,876
	Total for district.....	2,552	2,558	2,953	3,175	11,238
W.....	Civil.....	29	69	69	150	317
	Private.....	77	90	102	101	370
	Criminal.....	308	241	285	282	1,116
	Total for district.....	414	400	456	533	1,803
	Total for State.....	2,966	2,958	3,409	3,708	13,041
	CASES PENDING					
E.....	Civil.....	228	305	388	659	-----
	Private.....	328	432	529	508	-----
	Criminal.....	327	346	379	410	-----
	Total for district.....	883	1,083	1,296	1,577	-----
W.....	Civil.....	50	30	41	27	-----
	Private.....	82	94	92	67	-----
	Criminal.....	69	52	33	25	-----
	Total for district.....	201	176	166	119	-----
	Total for State.....	1,084	1,259	1,462	1,696	-----

MINNESOTA

Population, 1920..... 2,387,125

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
	CASES COMMENCED					
	Civil.....	232	261	852	1,408	2,753
	Private.....	376	606	382	341	1,705
	Criminal.....	778	698	1,364	1,771	4,611
	Total for State.....	1,386	1,565	2,598	3,520	9,069
	CASES TERMINATED					
	Civil.....	207	255	347	896	1,705
	Private.....	351	322	589	524	1,786
	Criminal.....	866	644	1,339	1,633	4,482
	Total for State.....	1,424	1,221	2,275	3,053	7,973

Business transacted in Federal courts of each State for the period beginning fiscal year 1926 and ending fiscal year 1929—Continued

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
	CASES PENDING					
	Civil.....	326	342	845	1,357	-----
	Private.....	634	918	711	528	-----
	Criminal.....	264	353	378	516	-----
	Total for State.....	1,224	1,613	1,934	2,401	-----

MISSISSIPPI

Population, 1920:
Northern district..... 809,026
Southern district..... 981,592

Total..... 1,790,618

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
	CASES COMMENCED					
N.....	Civil.....	58	69	101	117	345
	Private.....	56	43	44	55	198
	Criminal.....	253	351	489	516	1,609
	Total for district.....	367	463	634	688	2,152
S.....	Civil.....	31	34	24	64	153
	Private.....	378	136	141	158	813
	Criminal.....	281	242	498	290	1,311
	Total for district.....	690	412	663	512	2,277
	Total for State.....	1,057	875	1,297	1,200	4,429
	CASES TERMINATED					
N.....	Civil.....	53	61	86	112	312
	Private.....	72	47	46	53	218
	Criminal.....	271	367	498	472	1,608
	Total for district.....	396	475	630	637	2,138
S.....	Civil.....	47	44	43	22	156
	Private.....	137	107	151	144	539
	Criminal.....	323	299	439	338	1,399
	Total for district.....	507	450	633	504	2,094
	Total for State.....	903	925	1,263	1,141	4,232
	CASES PENDING					
N.....	Civil.....	23	31	41	46	-----
	Private.....	40	36	34	36	-----
	Criminal.....	152	145	132	177	-----
	Total for district.....	215	212	207	259	-----
S.....	Civil.....	41	30	10	50	-----
	Private.....	378	407	117	131	-----
	Criminal.....	160	102	161	100	-----
	Total for district.....	579	539	288	281	-----
	Total for State.....	794	751	495	540	-----

MISSOURI

Population, 1920:
Eastern district..... 1,705,147
Western district..... 1,698,908

Total..... 3,404,055

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
	CASES COMMENCED					
E.....	Civil.....	66	70	73	129	338
	Private.....	353	383	305	347	1,388
	Criminal.....	929	881	1,211	1,119	4,140
	Total for district.....	1,348	1,334	1,589	1,595	5,866
W.....	Civil.....	119	153	174	268	714
	Private.....	435	375	539	394	1,743
	Criminal.....	788	647	881	1,038	3,354
	Total for district.....	1,342	1,175	1,594	1,700	5,811
	Total for State.....	2,690	2,509	3,183	3,295	11,677
	CASES PENDING					
E.....	Civil.....	66	52	73	78	269
	Private.....	375	302	388	337	1,402
	Criminal.....	868	988	1,127	1,097	4,080
	Total for district.....	1,309	1,342	1,588	1,512	5,751

Business transacted in Federal courts of each State for the period beginning fiscal year 1926 and ending fiscal year 1929—Continued

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
W	CASES PENDING—continued					
	Civil	137	96	143	245	621
	Private	339	413	406	403	1,561
	Criminal	815	683	936	1,033	3,467
	Total for district	1,291	1,192	1,485	1,681	5,649
	Total for State	2,600	2,534	3,073	3,193	11,400
E	CASES TERMINATED					
	Civil	52	70	70	121	
	Private	448	454	371	381	
	Criminal	278	171	256	278	
	Total for district	778	695	697	780	
W	Civil	146	203	250	260	
	Private	545	507	640	631	
	Criminal	301	244	189	308	
	Total for district	992	954	1,079	1,199	
	Total for State	1,770	1,649	1,776	1,979	

MONTANA

Population, 1920..... 548,889

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
	CASES COMMENCED					
	Civil	312	190	485	976	1,963
	Private	98	81	74	51	304
	Criminal	512	438	874	1,362	3,186
	Total for State	922	709	1,433	2,389	5,453
	CASES TERMINATED					
	Civil	325	178	234	822	1,559
	Private	97	71	79	53	300
	Criminal	480	345	832	1,202	2,859
	Total for State	902	594	1,145	2,077	4,718
	CASES PENDING					
	Civil	134	146	308	552	
	Private	203	213	208	206	
	Criminal	193	286	328	488	
	Total for State	530	645	934	1,246	

NEBRASKA

Population, 1920..... 1,296,372

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
	CASES COMMENCED					
	Civil	118	159	193	144	614
	Private	250	231	215	204	900
	Criminal	516	507	805	419	2,247
	Total for State	884	897	1,213	767	3,761
	CASES TERMINATED					
	Civil	140	134	127	93	494
	Private	221	244	254	262	981
	Criminal	552	565	692	436	2,245
	Total for State	913	943	1,073	791	3,720
	CASES PENDING					
	Civil	136	161	225	276	
	Private	396	412	374	314	
	Criminal	315	257	370	353	
	Total for State	847	830	969	943	

NEVADA

Population, 1920..... 77,407

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
	CASES COMMENCED					
	Civil	137	68	63	75	343
	Private	16	19	19	15	69
	Criminal	465	240	186	243	1,124
	Total for State	618	317	268	333	1,536
	CASES TERMINATED					
	Civil	63	100	148	66	377
	Private	31	42	20	22	115
	Criminal	344	368	285	241	1,238
	Total for State	438	510	453	329	1,730

Business transacted in Federal courts of each State for the period beginning fiscal year 1926 and ending fiscal year 1929—Continued

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
	CASES PENDING					
	Civil	192	156	71	80	
	Private	65	42	41	34	
	Criminal	334	196	97	102	
	Total for State	591	394	209	216	

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Population, 1920..... 443,083

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
	CASES COMMENCED					
	Civil	120	60	116	99	395
	Private	45	25	19	18	107
	Criminal	290	291	367	347	1,295
	Total for State	455	376	502	464	1,797
	CASES TERMINATED					
	Civil	114	72	112	90	388
	Private	55	31	26	15	127
	Criminal	285	307	361	335	1,288
	Total for State	454	410	499	440	1,803
	CASES PENDING					
	Civil	14	2	6	15	
	Private	28	22	15	18	
	Criminal	24	8	14	26	
	Total for State	66	32	35	59	

NEW JERSEY

Population, 1920..... 3,155,900

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
	CASES COMMENCED					
	Civil	1,177	865	751	1,155	3,948
	Private	542	664	616	503	2,325
	Criminal	925	510	762	1,041	3,238
	Total for State	2,644	2,039	2,129	2,699	9,511
	CASES TERMINATED					
	Civil	1,035	983	651	1,054	3,723
	Private	353	518	792	867	2,530
	Criminal	2,739	635	628	1,051	5,053
	Total for State	4,127	2,136	2,071	2,972	11,306
	CASES PENDING					
	Civil	1,362	1,244	1,344	1,445	
	Private	1,082	1,228	1,052	688	
	Criminal	1,030	905	1,039	1,029	
	Total for State	3,474	3,377	3,435	3,162	

NEW MEXICO

Population, 1920..... 360,350

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
	CASES COMMENCED					
	Civil	36	38	25	59	158
	Private	81	59	64	56	260
	Criminal	341	298	293	387	1,319
	Total for State	458	395	382	502	1,737
	CASES TERMINATED					
	Civil	26	47	25	38	136
	Private	104	85	66	78	333
	Criminal	359	318	278	395	1,350
	Total for State	489	450	369	511	1,819
	CASES PENDING					
	Civil	26	17	17	38	
	Private	94	68	64	42	
	Criminal	68	48	63	55	
	Total for State	188	133	144	135	

NEW YORK

Population, 1920:
 Northern district..... 1,978,437
 Eastern district..... 2,840,295
 Southern district..... 3,801,364
 Western district..... 1,765,131
 Total..... 10,485,227

Business transacted in Federal courts of each State for the period beginning fiscal year 1926 and ending fiscal year 1929—Continued

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES COMMENCED						
N.	Civil	383	661	502	667	2,213
	Private	75	131	159	150	515
	Criminal	2,135	1,864	2,099	2,474	8,572
	Total for district	2,593	2,656	2,760	3,291	11,300
E.	Civil	931	903	1,259	1,061	4,154
	Private	1,980	2,096	1,634	694	6,404
	Criminal	2,608	2,349	2,227	2,343	9,527
	Total for district	5,519	5,348	5,120	4,098	20,085
S.	Civil	2,205	1,985	1,515	1,384	7,089
	Private	1,344	2,212	2,205	2,013	7,804
	Criminal	3,243	2,059	9,708	8,374	23,384
	Total for district	6,792	6,286	13,428	11,771	38,277
W.	Civil	412	247	340	558	1,557
	Private	166	188	253	180	787
	Criminal	1,715	1,674	1,181	1,843	6,413
	Total for district	2,293	2,109	1,774	2,581	8,757
CASES TERMINATED						
N.	Civil	282	668	561	589	2,100
	Private	52	73	150	91	366
	Criminal	2,095	2,015	1,968	2,759	8,837
	Total for district	2,429	2,756	2,679	3,439	11,303
E.	Civil	708	1,282	1,299	1,343	4,582
	Private	529	1,748	1,246	962	4,485
	Criminal	2,363	2,360	4,727	2,485	11,935
	Total for district	3,600	5,340	7,272	4,790	21,002
S.	Civil	2,293	3,236	1,067	1,352	7,948
	Private	1,575	2,805	1,501	2,070	7,951
	Criminal	6,225	2,135	8,863	8,202	25,425
	Total for district	10,093	8,176	11,431	11,624	41,324
W.	Civil	275	272	271	462	1,280
	Private	199	149	339	195	882
	Criminal	1,094	2,483	1,222	1,239	6,038
	Total for district	1,568	2,904	1,832	1,896	8,200
CASES PENDING						
N.	Civil	315	309	250	328	1,202
	Private	1,004	1,062	1,071	1,130	4,267
	Criminal	1,244	1,092	1,199	914	4,449
	Total for district	2,563	2,463	2,520	2,372	9,918
E.	Civil	1,655	1,326	1,286	1,041	5,308
	Private	7,294	7,642	8,030	7,762	30,728
	Criminal	3,708	3,697	1,204	1,098	9,707
	Total for district	12,657	12,665	10,520	9,901	45,743
S.	Civil	4,594	3,343	3,791	3,823	15,551
	Private	4,499	3,936	4,640	4,583	17,658
	Criminal	2,077	1,931	2,776	2,948	9,732
	Total for district	11,170	9,210	11,207	11,354	41,941
W.	Civil	478	453	522	618	2,071
	Private	349	387	314	299	1,349
	Criminal	2,101	1,292	1,251	1,855	6,549
	Total for district	2,928	2,132	2,087	2,772	9,919
Total for State						
29,318 26,570 26,334 26,399						

NORTH CAROLINA

Population, 1920:	
Eastern district	1,164,785
Middle district	725,344
Western district	668,994
Total	2,559,123

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES COMMENCED						
E.	Civil	80	123	88	74	365
	Private	176	122	125	118	541
	Criminal	563	488	561	877	2,489
	Total for district	819	733	774	1,069	3,395

Business transacted in Federal courts of each State for the period beginning fiscal year 1926 and ending fiscal year 1929—Continued

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES COMMENCED—continued						
M.	Civil (middle district not created until 1927).		114	226	128	468
	Private		64	71	46	181
	Criminal		356	721	772	1,849
	Total for district		534	1,018	946	2,498
W.	Civil	174	223	112	226	735
	Private	93	107	144	108	452
	Criminal	1,292	849	627	568	3,336
	Total for district	1,559	1,179	883	902	4,523
CASES TERMINATED						
E.	Civil	79	140	72	71	362
	Private	163	185	203	142	693
	Criminal	597	542	560	865	2,564
	Total for district	839	867	835	1,078	3,619
M.	Civil (middle district not created until 1927).		1	230	171	402
	Private		5	62	41	108
	Criminal		21	656	706	1,383
	Total for district		27	948	918	1,893
W.	Civil	154	295	130	133	712
	Private	84	120	111	117	432
	Criminal	1,260	1,003	767	915	3,945
	Total for district	1,498	1,418	1,008	1,165	5,089
CASES PENDING						
E.	Civil	61	44	60	63	228
	Private	360	297	219	195	1,071
	Criminal	206	152	153	165	676
	Total for district	627	493	432	423	2,075
M.	Civil (middle district, not created until 1927).		113	109	66	388
	Private		59	68	73	200
	Criminal		335	400	466	1,201
	Total for district		507	577	605	1,690
W.	Civil	180	108	90	183	561
	Private	231	211	198	189	829
	Criminal	1,063	909	769	422	3,163
	Total for district	1,474	1,228	1,057	794	4,553
Total for State						
2,101 2,228 2,066 1,822						

NORTH DAKOTA

Population, 1920..... 646,872

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES COMMENCED						
	Civil	73	68	54	30	225
	Private	101	94	81	92	368
	Criminal	151	110	112	155	528
	Total for State	325	272	247	277	1,121
CASES TERMINATED						
	Civil	31	65	78	48	222
	Private	163	78	107	91	439
	Criminal	154	72	168	132	526
	Total for State	348	215	353	271	1,187
CASES PENDING						
	Civil	72	75	51	33	231
	Private	91	107	81	82	361
	Criminal	171	209	154	177	611
	Total for State	334	391	286	292	1,303

OHIO

Population, 1920:	
Northern district	3,195,677
Southern district	2,563,717
Total	5,759,394

Business transacted in Federal courts of each State for the period beginning fiscal year 1926 and ending fiscal year 1929—Continued

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES COMMENCED						
N	Civil	503	539	508	534	2,084
	Private	815	1,020	893	737	3,465
	Criminal	1,337	1,005	1,142	1,225	4,709
	Total for district	2,655	2,564	2,543	2,496	10,258
S	Civil	110	197	310	374	991
	Private	328	294	267	278	1,167
	Criminal	318	402	663	555	1,938
	Total for district	756	893	1,240	1,207	4,096
	Total for State	3,411	3,457	3,783	3,703	14,354
CASES TERMINATED						
N	Civil	517	531	563	414	2,025
	Private	890	828	932	804	3,454
	Criminal	1,388	1,104	1,091	1,249	4,822
	Total for district	2,795	2,463	2,586	2,467	10,311
S	Civil	127	169	293	201	790
	Private	281	268	249	262	1,060
	Criminal	316	438	621	446	1,821
	Total for district	724	875	1,163	909	3,671
	Total for State	3,519	3,338	3,749	3,376	13,982
CASES PENDING						
N	Civil	356	364	309	429	1,458
	Private	651	843	804	737	3,035
	Criminal	598	469	520	496	2,083
	Total for district	1,575	1,676	1,633	1,662	6,546
S	Civil	58	86	103	276	523
	Private	395	421	439	455	1,710
	Criminal	91	74	116	225	506
	Total for district	544	581	658	956	2,739
	Total for State	2,119	2,257	2,291	2,618	9,285

OKLAHOMA

Population, 1920:	
Northern district	403,687
Eastern district	830,513
Western district	794,083
Total	2,028,283

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES COMMENCED						
N	Civil	63	55	110	95	314
	Private	270	191	239	191	911
	Criminal	761	746	1,090	794	3,391
	Total for district	1,094	992	1,439	1,071	4,616
E	Civil	57	60	61	76	254
	Private	239	177	332	286	1,034
	Criminal	861	1,027	1,055	950	3,893
	Total for district	1,157	1,264	1,448	1,312	5,181
W	Civil	120	95	77	97	389
	Private	184	133	251	224	792
	Criminal	659	587	681	699	2,626
	Total for district	963	815	1,009	1,020	3,807
	Total for State	3,214	3,071	3,916	3,403	13,604
CASES TERMINATED						
N	Civil	46	38	102	94	380
	Private	173	203	182	239	797
	Criminal	581	566	1,008	760	3,005
	Total for district	800	807	1,332	1,093	4,032
E	Civil	62	49	57	64	232
	Private	343	150	240	381	1,114
	Criminal	821	1,151	1,182	910	4,064
	Total for district	1,226	1,350	1,479	1,355	5,410
W	Civil	54	82	66	64	266
	Private	218	133	191	189	731
	Criminal	623	614	662	641	2,540
	Total for district	895	829	919	894	3,537
	Total for State	2,921	2,986	3,780	3,342	13,029

Business transacted in Federal courts of each State for the period beginning fiscal year 1926 and ending fiscal year 1929—Continued

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES PENDING						
N	Civil	46	63	71	58	238
	Private	208	196	273	225	902
	Criminal	342	522	514	548	1,926
	Total for district	596	781	858	831	3,066
E	Civil	51	62	66	78	257
	Private	235	262	354	259	910
	Criminal	493	369	242	282	1,386
	Total for district	779	693	662	619	2,753
W	Civil	111	124	135	146	516
	Private	174	174	234	269	851
	Criminal	572	545	564	601	2,282
	Total for district	857	843	933	1,016	3,649
	Total for State	2,232	2,317	2,453	2,466	9,468

OREGON

Population, 1920: 783,389

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES COMMENCED						
	Civil	143	146	116	179	584
	Private	188	152	141	166	647
	Criminal	412	391	431	335	1,569
	Total for State	743	689	688	680	2,800
CASES TERMINATED						
	Civil	123	175	114	130	542
	Private	219	175	177	132	703
	Criminal	462	463	493	338	1,756
	Total for State	804	813	784	600	3,001
CASES PENDING						
	Civil	99	70	75	124	368
	Private	306	158	122	156	742
	Criminal	269	197	130	127	723
	Total for State	674	425	327	407	1,833

PENNSYLVANIA

Population, 1920:	
Eastern district	3,287,781
Middle district	1,987,383
Western district	3,444,853
Total	8,720,017

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES COMMENCED						
E	Civil	427	497	659	725	2,308
	Private	411	463	461	464	1,799
	Criminal	467	310	552	945	2,274
	Total for district	1,305	1,270	1,672	2,134	6,381
M	Civil	118	69	119	113	419
	Private	72	61	101	95	329
	Criminal	474	390	456	422	1,842
	Total for district	664	520	676	630	2,590
W	Civil	335	1,625	1,535	1,474	4,969
	Private	485	169	247	264	1,165
	Criminal	1,312	1,811	1,377	1,269	5,769
	Total for district	2,132	3,605	3,159	3,007	11,903
	Total for State	4,101	5,395	5,507	5,871	20,874
CASES TERMINATED						
E	Civil	466	527	760	706	2,459
	Private	265	570	398	427	1,660
	Criminal	533	580	614	895	2,622
	Total for district	1,264	1,677	1,772	2,028	6,741
M	Civil	92	85	101	124	402
	Private	97	70	116	127	410
	Criminal	1,549	427	482	529	2,987
	Total for district	1,738	582	699	780	3,799

Business transacted in Federal courts of each State for the period beginning fiscal year 1926 and ending fiscal year 1929—Continued

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES TERMINATED—CON.						
W	Civil	397	1,387	1,461	1,464	4,709
	Private	974	117	116	674	1,881
	Criminal	1,218	1,510	1,659	1,379	5,766
	Total for district	2,589	3,014	3,236	3,517	12,356
	Total for State	5,591	5,273	5,707	6,325	22,896
CASES PENDING						
E	Civil	888	858	757	776	
	Private	1,547	1,440	1,503	1,540	
	Criminal	615	355	293	343	
	Total for district	3,050	2,653	2,553	2,659	
M	Civil	106	90	108	97	
	Private	209	200	185	153	
	Criminal	169	132	106	99	
	Total for district	484	422	399	349	
W	Civil	327	565	643	647	
	Private	1,516	1,568	1,482	1,043	
	Criminal	400	788	506	396	
	Total for district	2,243	2,921	2,631	2,086	
	Total for State	5,777	5,996	5,583	5,094	

Population, 1920..... RHODE ISLAND..... 604,397

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES COMMENCED						
	Civil	128	127	119	119	493
	Private	42	47	45	47	181
	Criminal	328	297	225	336	1,186
	Total for State	498	471	389	502	1,860
CASES TERMINATED						
	Civil	103	159	121	153	536
	Private	45	38	84	52	219
	Criminal	399	240	279	364	1,282
	Total for State	547	437	484	569	2,037
CASES PENDING						
	Civil	125	92	90	56	
	Private	91	99	60	55	
	Criminal	98	156	102	75	
	Total for State	314	347	252	186	

Population, 1920:
 Eastern district..... 965,010
 Western district..... 718,714
 Total..... 1,683,724

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES COMMENCED						
E	Civil	26	54	24	41	145
	Private	229	150	174	137	690
	Criminal	388	216	261	548	1,413
	Total for district	643	420	459	726	2,248
W	Civil	73	52	64	65	254
	Private	57	38	89	50	234
	Criminal	443	271	333	329	1,376
	Total for district	573	361	486	444	1,864
	Total for State	1,216	781	945	1,170	4,112
CASES TERMINATED						
E	Civil	42	34	35	40	151
	Private	226	146	208	124	704
	Criminal	476	236	246	398	1,356
	Total for district	744	416	489	562	2,211
W	Civil	61	70	55	70	256
	Private	59	41	65	72	237
	Criminal	484	294	341	326	1,445
	Total for district	604	405	461	468	1,938
	Total for State	1,348	821	950	1,030	4,149

Business transacted in Federal courts of each State for the period beginning fiscal year 1926 and ending fiscal year 1929—Continued

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES PENDING						
E	Civil	37	57	46	47	
	Private	159	163	129	142	
	Criminal	535	515	530	680	
	Total for district	731	735	705	869	
W	Civil	42	24	33	28	
	Private	60	57	81	59	
	Criminal	140	117	109	112	
	Total for district	242	198	223	199	
	Total for State	973	933	928	1,068	

Population 1920..... SOUTH DAKOTA..... 783,339

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES COMMENCED						
	Civil	33	25	27	28	113
	Private	140	136	78	68	422
	Criminal	404	172	286	311	1,173
	Total for State	577	333	391	407	1,708
CASES TERMINATED						
	Civil	7	38	49	35	129
	Private	94	105	203	92	494
	Criminal	239	322	288	349	1,198
	Total for State	340	465	540	476	1,821
CASES PENDING						
	Civil	88	75	53	43	
	Private	285	316	191	167	
	Criminal	367	217	215	177	
	Total for State	740	608	459	387	

Population, 1920:
 Eastern district..... 804,581
 Middle district..... 830,752
 Western district..... 702,552
 Total..... 2,337,885

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES COMMENCED						
E	Civil	160	114	138	251	663
	Private	47	56	63	70	236
	Criminal	1,092	648	823	813	3,376
	Total for district	1,299	818	1,024	1,134	4,275
M	Civil	98	68	118	134	418
	Private	36	29	26	31	122
	Criminal	685	794	575	618	2,672
	Total for district	819	891	719	783	3,212
W	Civil	63	69	84	49	265
	Private	73	48	59	44	224
	Criminal	304	196	365	276	1,141
	Total for district	440	313	508	369	1,630
	Total for State	2,558	2,022	2,251	2,286	9,117
CASES TERMINATED						
E	Civil	178	132	138	155	603
	Private	63	44	55	80	242
	Criminal	1,032	666	799	1,006	3,503
	Total for district	1,273	842	992	1,241	4,348
M	Civil	130	58	122	121	431
	Private	61	29	30	23	143
	Criminal	822	613	676	462	2,572
	Total for district	1,013	700	827	606	3,146
W	Civil	75	49	89	28	241
	Private	52	63	81	37	233
	Criminal	457	216	335	300	1,338
	Total for district	614	328	505	365	1,812
	Total for State	2,900	1,870	2,324	2,212	9,306

Business transacted in Federal courts of each State for the period beginning fiscal year 1926 and ending fiscal year 1929—Continued

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES PENDING						
E.....	Civil.....	103	85	85	181
	Private.....	61	73	81	72
	Criminal.....	391	373	397	204
	Total for district.....	555	531	563	457
M.....	Civil.....	69	79	75	88
	Private.....	68	68	64	72
	Criminal.....	382	563	463	619
	Total for district.....	519	710	602	779
W.....	Civil.....	21	41	37	58
	Private.....	114	99	76	83
	Criminal.....	70	50	80	56
	Total for district.....	205	190	193	197
	Total for State.....	1,279	1,431	1,358	1,433

TEXAS

Population, 1920:	
Northern district.....	1,428,593
Eastern district.....	1,144,483
Southern district.....	850,751
Western district.....	1,239,401
Total.....	4,673,228

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES COMMENCED						
N.....	Civil.....	125	73	117	160	475
	Private.....	282	358	414	357	1,411
	Criminal.....	538	940	1,552	1,171	4,201
	Total for district.....	945	1,371	2,083	1,688	6,087
E.....	Civil.....	36	47	78	63	224
	Private.....	123	153	148	170	594
	Criminal.....	263	243	423	449	1,378
	Total for district.....	422	443	649	682	2,196
S.....	Civil.....	183	245	204	262	894
	Private.....	134	145	160	136	575
	Criminal.....	690	928	956	1,290	3,864
	Total for district.....	1,007	1,318	1,320	1,688	5,333
W.....	Civil.....	98	102	133	118	451
	Private.....	142	145	140	220	647
	Criminal.....	1,399	1,357	1,437	1,610	5,803
	Total for district.....	1,639	1,604	1,710	1,948	6,901
	Total for State.....	4,013	4,736	5,762	5,006	20,517
CASES TERMINATED						
N.....	Civil.....	114	77	101	147	439
	Private.....	335	347	403	397	1,482
	Criminal.....	580	970	1,533	1,144	4,227
	Total for district.....	1,029	1,394	2,037	1,688	6,148
E.....	Civil.....	52	41	77	63	233
	Private.....	125	161	199	148	633
	Criminal.....	291	241	422	467	1,421
	Total for district.....	468	443	698	678	2,287
S.....	Civil.....	206	274	199	219	898
	Private.....	146	191	158	141	636
	Criminal.....	807	910	958	1,273	3,948
	Total for district.....	1,159	1,375	1,315	1,633	5,482
W.....	Civil.....	115	116	128	89	448
	Private.....	187	133	151	224	695
	Criminal.....	1,421	1,409	1,458	1,616	5,904
	Total for district.....	1,723	1,658	1,737	1,929	7,047
	Total for State.....	4,379	4,870	5,787	5,928	20,964
CASES PENDING						
N.....	Civil.....	83	79	94	107
	Private.....	299	310	321	281
	Criminal.....	188	158	178	205
	Total for district.....	570	547	593	593
E.....	Civil.....	17	23	24	24
	Private.....	145	137	86	108
	Criminal.....	60	62	63	45
	Total for district.....	222	222	173	177

Business transacted in Federal courts of each State for the period beginning fiscal year 1926 and ending fiscal year 1929—Continued

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES PENDING—continued						
S.....	Civil.....	150	121	126	169
	Private.....	162	116	118	113
	Criminal.....	158	176	174	191
	Total for district.....	470	413	418	473
W.....	Civil.....	64	50	55	84
	Private.....	126	138	127	123
	Criminal.....	241	189	168	162
	Total for district.....	431	377	250	369
	Total for State.....	1,093	1,559	1,434	1,612

UTAH

Population, 1920..... 449,396

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES COMMENCED						
	Civil.....	37	24	92	72	225
	Private.....	51	46	65	41	203
	Criminal.....	134	105	201	122	562
	Total for State.....	222	175	358	235	990
CASES TERMINATED						
	Civil.....	25	27	76	91	219
	Private.....	61	66	63	46	236
	Criminal.....	164	113	168	151	596
	Total for State.....	250	206	307	288	1,051
CASES PENDING						
	Civil.....	33	30	46	27
	Private.....	68	48	50	45
	Criminal.....	75	67	100	71
	Total for State.....	176	145	196	143

VERMONT

Population, 1920..... 352,428

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES COMMENCED						
	Civil.....	55	46	39	31	171
	Private.....	12	25	22	19	78
	Criminal.....	184	197	179	265	825
	Total for State.....	251	268	240	315	1,074
CASES TERMINATED						
	Civil.....	35	46	55	29	165
	Private.....	25	13	20	25	83
	Criminal.....	210	201	157	271	839
	Total for State.....	270	260	232	325	1,087
CASES PENDING						
	Civil.....	36	36	20	22
	Private.....	56	68	70	64
	Criminal.....	104	100	122	116
	Total for State.....	196	204	212	202

VIRGINIA

Population, 1920:	
Eastern district.....	1,204,774
Western district.....	1,104,413
Total.....	2,309,187

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES COMMENCED						
E.....	Civil.....	112	82	92	113	399
	Private.....	153	165	129	118	565
	Criminal.....	435	298	307	285	1,325
	Total for district.....	700	545	528	516	2,289
W.....	Civil.....	175	143	58	70	446
	Private.....	59	47	25	43	174
	Criminal.....	236	316	366	337	1,254
	Total for district.....	469	506	449	450	1,874
	Total for State.....	1,169	1,051	917	966	4,163

Business transacted in Federal courts of each State for the period beginning fiscal year 1926 and ending fiscal year 1929—Continued

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES TERMINATED						
E.....	Civil.....	130	99	123	80	432
	Private.....	250	260	176	118	804
	Criminal.....	472	308	300	302	1,382
	Total for district.....	852	667	599	500	2,618
W.....	Civil.....	194	118	61	59	432
	Private.....	66	37	43	40	186
	Criminal.....	512	305	383	331	1,531
	Total for district.....	772	460	487	430	2,149
	Total for State.....	1,624	1,127	1,086	930	4,767
CASES PENDING						
E.....	Civil.....	22	88	57	90	257
	Private.....	226	131	84	84	525
	Criminal.....	138	128	135	118	519
	Total for district.....	386	347	276	292	1,299
W.....	Civil.....	45	70	39	50	204
	Private.....	50	60	42	45	197
	Criminal.....	127	138	121	127	513
	Total for district.....	222	268	202	222	914
	Total for State.....	608	615	478	514	2,215

WASHINGTON

Population, 1920:	
Eastern district.....	437,191
Western district.....	919,430
Total.....	1,356,621

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES COMMENCED						
E.....	Civil.....	34	34	38	84	190
	Private.....	58	56	42	53	209
	Criminal.....	172	138	259	169	738
	Total for district.....	264	228	339	306	1,137
W.....	Civil.....	238	242	262	496	1,238
	Private.....	210	176	218	149	753
	Criminal.....	1,077	944	749	715	3,485
	Total for district.....	1,525	1,362	1,229	1,360	5,476
	Total for State.....	1,789	1,590	1,568	1,666	6,613
CASES TERMINATED						
E.....	Civil.....	45	39	45	43	172
	Private.....	41	57	55	46	199
	Criminal.....	178	155	207	205	745
	Total for district.....	264	251	307	294	1,116
W.....	Civil.....	282	201	284	315	1,082
	Private.....	255	162	205	185	807
	Criminal.....	1,034	681	1,161	853	3,729
	Total for district.....	1,571	1,044	1,650	1,353	5,618
	Total for State.....	1,835	1,295	1,957	1,647	6,734
CASES PENDING						
E.....	Civil.....	31	26	19	60	136
	Private.....	76	75	62	69	282
	Criminal.....	61	42	94	58	255
	Total for district.....	168	143	175	187	673
W.....	Civil.....	170	212	194	373	959
	Private.....	206	220	233	197	856
	Criminal.....	514	776	381	246	1,917
	Total for district.....	890	1,208	808	816	3,722
	Total for State.....	1,058	1,351	983	1,003	4,395

WEST VIRGINIA

Population, 1920:	
Northern district.....	695,066
Southern district.....	768,635
Total.....	1,463,701

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES COMMENCED						
N.....	Civil.....	83	111	165	187	546
	Private.....	51	48	47	52	198
	Criminal.....	593	692	819	748	2,852
	Total for district.....	727	851	1,031	987	3,596

Business transacted in Federal courts of each State for the period beginning fiscal year 1926 and ending fiscal year 1929—Continued

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES COMMENCED—continued						
S.....	Civil.....	325	351	335	375	1,386
	Private.....	131	119	95	115	460
	Criminal.....	2,469	2,663	2,428	2,177	9,737
	Total for district.....	2,925	3,133	2,858	2,667	11,583
	Total for State.....	3,652	3,984	3,889	3,654	15,179
CASES TERMINATED						
N.....	Civil.....	83	35	166	214	498
	Private.....	47	37	50	54	188
	Criminal.....	661	688	1,029	706	3,084
	Total for district.....	791	760	1,245	974	3,770
S.....	Civil.....	290	362	329	269	1,250
	Private.....	198	101	133	137	569
	Criminal.....	2,215	2,610	2,619	2,007	9,541
	Total for district.....	2,703	3,073	2,081	2,503	11,360
	Total for State.....	3,494	3,833	4,326	3,477	15,130
CASES PENDING						
N.....	Civil.....	67	149	148	121	485
	Private.....	133	144	141	189	597
	Criminal.....	265	269	59	100	703
	Total for district.....	465	562	348	360	1,735
S.....	Civil.....	204	193	199	220	816
	Private.....	156	174	136	114	580
	Criminal.....	820	893	702	782	3,207
	Total for district.....	1,180	1,260	1,037	1,116	4,593
	Total for State.....	1,645	1,822	1,385	1,476	6,328

WISCONSIN

Population, 1920:	
Eastern district.....	1,440,983
Western district.....	1,190,770
Total.....	2,631,753

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES COMMENCED						
E.....	Civil.....	198	82	162	186	628
	Private.....	114	93	118	106	431
	Criminal.....	223	153	361	528	1,265
	Total for district.....	535	328	641	820	2,324
W.....	Civil.....	34	83	60	70	247
	Private.....	63	44	53	86	246
	Criminal.....	140	137	278	363	918
	Total for district.....	237	264	391	519	1,411
	Total for State.....	772	592	1,032	1,339	3,735
CASES TERMINATED						
E.....	Civil.....	193	83	116	234	626
	Private.....	102	89	114	96	401
	Criminal.....	232	123	386	376	1,117
	Total for district.....	527	295	616	706	2,144
W.....	Civil.....	46	67	58	58	229
	Private.....	47	56	67	48	218
	Criminal.....	123	173	226	350	872
	Total for district.....	216	296	351	456	1,319
	Total for State.....	743	591	967	1,162	3,463
CASES PENDING						
E.....	Civil.....	46	45	91	43	225
	Private.....	135	139	143	153	570
	Criminal.....	74	104	79	231	488
	Total for district.....	255	288	313	427	1,283
W.....	Civil.....	14	30	32	44	120
	Private.....	119	107	93	131	450
	Criminal.....	133	97	149	162	531
	Total for district.....	266	234	274	337	1,111
	Total for State.....	521	522	587	764	2,394

WYOMING

Population 1920.....	194,402
----------------------	---------

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES COMMENCED						
	Civil.....	30	28	40	52	150
	Private.....	94	38	37	36	205
	Criminal.....	121	84	141	124	470
	Total for State.....	245	150	218	212	825

Business transacted in Federal courts of each State for the period beginning fiscal year 1926 and ending fiscal year 1929—Continued

District	Cases	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total
CASES TERMINATED						
Civil.....		34	36	39	48	157
Private.....		81	60	60	35	236
Criminal.....		163	79	145	121	508
Total for State.....		278	175	244	204	901
CASES PENDING						
Civil.....		29	21	22	26	-----
Private.....		95	72	49	50	-----
Criminal.....		28	33	29	33	-----
Total for State.....		152	126	100	109	-----

IMPROVEMENT OF PROCEDURE IN IMPEACHMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the special order of the House the gentleman, from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. We have listened to a very interesting and instructive address dealing with the work of the judiciary.

It is a good thing for Members of the House occasionally to turn aside from the pressure incident to the enactment of current legislation, and give consideration to things which are of permanent and general interest to the Government.

I want to direct your attention this afternoon to a condition which holds possibilities of substantial improvement, namely, procedure in impeachments. In theory the impeachment power is applicable to all civil officers of the Government. But due to limited tenure and to other methods of removal of all Federal officers other than members of the judiciary the importance of the impeachment power in our system of Government in practical operation is limited almost exclusively to judicial officers, who are appointed for life, conditioned only upon good behavior.

It is not probable there ever will develop in this country any necessity to call a large number of Federal judges to the bar of the Senate. As a rule Federal judges are high class, conscientious persons. But the fact that these officers are appointed for life makes clear that there is associated with that character of tenure a necessity for an efficient agency of supervision and control exercised in the public interest, not control of the opinion of judges, to be sure, but control of the conduct of judges as that conduct is related to public confidence and to integrity of public justice. It was never contemplated that we would either in theory or in fact establish in this country a lot of petty despots answerable to nobody, which would be the case, potentially at least, but for the power of removal which is embodied in the impeachment provisions of the Constitution. Not only is there inherent in this character of tenure the necessity for an effective agency for examination and determination affecting the question of "good behavior" as that expression is used in the Constitution, but there is also the highest necessity to protect Federal judges against intimidation and unnecessary annoyance through the unwarranted initiation or threatened initiation of impeachment proceedings.

The rapidity with which the Federal judiciary is being increased and the rapidity with which the business of the Houses of Congress is being increased changes the nature of this question from a more or less academic one to a very practical one which calls for immediate consideration.

There is nothing more interesting to the student of the development of our system of government than an examination of that power and the place which impeachment holds in the scheme of our Government.

Originally, impeachment was a criminal trial. Those who have examined the development of this power and this procedure tell us that it began in the fourteenth century, but a more careful examination of the history of our system of government discloses that it has always obtained. When the Anglo-Saxon system was tribal the power rested with the people to remove their public officials and to punish them. As the tribal governments were blended into principalities and principalities into petty kingdoms and petty kingdoms into larger governmental organizations, the direct control of the people over their public officials, of course, was lessened. The power became vested in the king and his councilors, with the deeper power of revolution, of course.

It would be interesting, but perhaps not profitable, to trace in detail the development of this extraordinary power, or rather of the agency through which it is exercised. Sufficient to say that by the fourteenth century the distinctive characteristics of the

impeachment procedure had developed. Two hundred years ago the identical procedure now had in the Senate had developed. There is a slight difference, but not important enough to make a modification of that statement necessary. The House of Commons appeared even then before the House of Lords by managers. Then it was a real, criminal trial, with the power over property, liberty, and life. One judgment I recall confiscated the property, tortured the person convicted, hanged him, beheaded him, and quartered him—otherwise they did not do anything to him at all.

When we came to write the impeachment provisions of our Constitution we deprived the Senate of all power to punish for crime, but we retained in practice the identical procedure which obtained under the English system where the House of Lords had the power to convict and execute.

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman answer a question?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I am sorry, but I can not yield now. I will yield as soon as I get through my statement. I stand by my statement, if that is the point.

Under our Constitution, judgment is limited to removal from office with the possibility of a judgment in bar; in other words, it is the recapture clause in our Constitution dealing with powers delegated to public officials. It is an ouster proceeding, and that is all, with the possibility of a judgment in bar.

Really, Members of the House, if a modern Dickens should come on the scene and witness the managers of the House coming to the bar of the Senate, when the question involved is whether a district judge ought to continue in office, and with the tremendous responsibility of the Government of this Nation resting upon the Senate of the United States, and see that entire Senate of 96 Members suspending all their legislative and other duties to devote themselves exclusively for weeks to hearing all the evidence from the lips of witnesses in order to determine whether or not a district judge ought to be ousted; I say, if a modern Dickens should come on the scene and witness that, he could write a book that would make the world laugh longer and louder than Dickens made the world laugh as he portrayed the ridiculous procedure in the courts of chancery of England.

I have introduced a resolution, which has been pending before the Rules Committee for a year, to have the House appoint a committee of three and the Senate appoint a committee of three to constitute a joint committee to study this question and to ascertain if it is not possible to improve this method of procedure with regard to impeachment, and I hope the ladies and gentlemen of the House will bring to bear whatever persuasive influence they can upon the gentlemen who sit up there in the Rules Committee and make it possible for us now to study this question and report if this ridiculous procedure may not be improved.

I now yield for any questions that Members may want to propound.

Mr. BANKHEAD. If my friend will pardon me, in connection with the statement just made with reference to the attitude of the Rules Committee, I think I violate no confidence when I say that some objection was made to consideration of the gentleman's resolution upon the theory that the Committee on the Judiciary itself might appoint a subcommittee to study the question. The gentleman from Texas, when he was before the committee a few days ago, submitted a cogent reason why that would not meet the situation, and I wish the gentleman would restate it to the House.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. The reason that procedure, it seems to me, would not be the procedure suggested by the situation is this: The Judiciary Committee of the House has no general jurisdiction of the subject of impeachment. It is true that these matters, by reference, usually terminate with the Judiciary Committee of the House. This provision in our Constitution, of course, came indirectly from the procedure of Parliament. When the matter was considered in the Constitutional Convention there were a good many notions as to where the power ought to be placed. Finally, as occurred in most of the matters in controversy, it was settled by lifting some of the provisions of a State constitution already written. In this case we took the main part of our impeachment provision from the constitution of Massachusetts, and a very brief part of it from the constitution of New York. It is the power of the Government to rid itself of an official whose conduct demonstrates that he is unworthy to be an officer of the Government. The Judiciary Committee has no general jurisdiction which would warrant it in assuming responsibility.

Whatever committee is created ought to be created as the agent of the House. I think it would be a presumptuous thing for the Judiciary Committee to meet and select three of its members and undertake this responsibility. As a matter of fact, the major part of the procedure is in the Senate. The

trial is there. There is not much difficulty with what happens in the House.

Aside from the possibility that a study might disclose that something should be done further to control the exercise of the powers which are exercised in the House, the whole problem lies in the Senate. This power must be cautiously used. Power is lost in two ways; one is the nonuse and the other the abusive exercise of power.

In the main, as I have stated, the procedure is in the Senate. I do not want to anticipate what I think could be done, but I make this suggestion. I am sure that since this is an ouster suit the first thing to be done would be to determine in principle whether it is a civil or criminal procedure. When the committee comes to consider that question it is bound to determine that it is a civil procedure, because it is an ouster suit in its major aspect.

Having determined that, I see no reason why we could not abandon the present custom of bringing every witness in person before the Senate, there to testify to every fact in the case. The more important witnesses, perhaps, ought always to be called before the whole Senate; about that, however, I express no fixed opinion, but certainly committees and depositions could be used to a large extent.

When we had under consideration a comparatively recent case from Illinois I was one of the managers, and in the check-up we decided that under existing practice we would have to bring at least 100 people from southern Illinois to Washington at the inconvenience of the citizens, expense to the Government, and have them each testify before the whole Senate, in order to comply with the provisions of the Constitution to the effect that the defendant is entitled to be confronted with the witness, just as though we were trying a criminal case, and notwithstanding the fact that our Constitution declares that whatever trial for crimes committed is to be had must be in the ordinary courts in the ordinary way.

As I said a moment ago we have this anomalous situation, growing out of the fact that when we incorporated the impeachment power into our Constitution we stripped it of every aspect of a criminal case and yet in our practice have preserved the criminal procedure.

That is not the only instance in which such a thing as that occurs. The truth of it is, we make a mistake—even the Supreme Court seems to make it—in assuming that the men who sat in the Constitutional Convention fully comprehended the Constitution which was assembled. They did not create it. For 1,700 years within historical times it had been in process of creation.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I did not understand the gentleman to state the character of the measure which he proposes to ask the Committee on Rules to report upon.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I ask merely for a rule to make it possible for the House to consider a concurrent resolution for the appointment of three Members of the House and three Members of the Senate to study the procedure in impeachments and ascertain if a better method might not be worked out, and to report their conclusions to the House and to the Senate.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I was wondering why the very able and powerful Judiciary Committee of the House could not take that up and study the question and reach a conclusion.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I have studied the question. I suggest to my friend from Virginia [Mr. Moore], who has had experience, that I have been sitting almost at the door of the Committee on Rules for a year even to get a hearing on this rule. I am willing to do this work, but I am not willing to go over to the Senate merely as the agent of a committee of the House and try to get them to cooperate. If I go over there, I want to go with the prestige and support of the registered judgment of the House of Representatives that this ought to be done. That is what I want. If it is a thing that ought to be done, why can not the House consider it?

The Committee on the Judiciary has no authority with reference to it. It is not its business. The Judiciary Committee is the creature of the House; and I want this committee of the House Members, if it is created, to be the creature of the House, and have this matter presented to the Senate in the regular and orderly way—as a resolution coming from the House presents itself, not to a committee of the Senate, but to the Senate itself. I hope at least that the gentlemen of the Committee on Rules will let this resolution come to the floor of the House and make it possible to have this committee created, make it possible for this study to be made, at a time when there is no impeachment pending. That is the time to study this question, when we can do it deliberately, and not while an impeachment proceeding is pending.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. I am satisfied that the gentleman has devoted a great deal of thought and study to the proposition and that he has formulated a plan. Could he not introduce a resolution amending the practice, instead of asking for this committee to be appointed? I know the House would have just as much confidence in the resolution or bill that he would prepare and submit to the House as it would have in any recommendation of the committee that would be appointed.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I appreciate very much the compliment of the gentleman from Illinois, but the difficulty is that most of this procedure is in the Senate. The difficulty lies in the major part beyond the jurisdiction of the House. Do I make myself clear?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I see no other way to reach it than that which I have indicated.

Mr. SABATH. I am of opinion that if the House passes the gentleman's resolution and it reaches the Senate, it would receive that consideration which bills and resolutions passed by this House which reach the Senate usually receive.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. As I stated a moment ago, this power of impeachment and the several responsibilities of the House and the Senate in regard to impeachment are not joint responsibilities except in a limited and qualified sense. The House is a complete entity clothed with a distinct nonlegislative responsibility and the Senate is a complete entity clothed with a distinct nonlegislative responsibility. When they come to deal with the power of impeachment they do not deal with it as a matter that belongs to Congress. The House and the Senate do not act as constituent elements of the Congress. In other words, if we resolve in the House with regard to procedure in the House in impeachment matters, that resolution would never reach the Senate, because it is a matter with regard to which the Senate has no jurisdiction whatever. On the other hand, if the Senate resolves with regard to procedure of the Senate, that resolution would never reach the House. This is not as a bill, and the only thing with regard to which the House and Senate could properly concur would be with regard to the creation of this committee. Even the term "concurrent resolution" is a misnomer, because the Senate can not concur in any authoritative sense in what is done in the House as to this matter. What I have in mind is that Representatives of the House and Representatives of the Senate should get together and talk over this whole question of procedure so that the Representatives of the House may come back to their Chamber and make a report to the House as to what has been agreed the House ought to do to improve procedure, and the Representatives of the Senate could go back to the Senate and report to the Senate what is the judgment as to what the Senate should do to improve procedure. This is not a legislative procedure, in any sense, which I am suggesting.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. In theory, at least, the House in impeachment proceedings acts as a grand jury and returns an indictment and the Senate acts as a jury and tries the case. Has the gentleman in his research found any justification for that procedure? Did the procedure for impeachment antedate the development of the grand-jury system or vice versa?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. There does not seem to have been any relationship between the development of the procedure with reference to impeachment and the development of the procedure such as the gentleman has indicated, except, of course, that having originated among the same people naturally there was some parallel in the line of development.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. STEVENSON. The question I desired to ask a while ago was this. The gentleman spoke of the power of impeachment and condemnation and confiscation of property. Was not the confiscation of property the result of a bill of attainder? The impeachment and bill of attainder were two separate things, and when they came to establish our Constitution it prohibited all bills of attainder. That was the clause of the Constitution which cut off the forfeiture of property and probably the capital punishment that grew out of that.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Both the procedure in impeachment and attainder were used as agencies for the forfeiture of estates. The fact is that during a good many years the same sort of thing was accomplished under each of the procedures. As a matter of fact, between the Cromwell revolution and our Declaration of Independence there were very few impeachments. The Hastings impeachment was pending when we were writing our Federal Constitution, and Burke, in his argument in the

Warren Hastings case, made the most comprehensive analytical and philosophical statement of the place that impeachment holds in governments of our sort that has ever been made, in my judgment. It is as follows:

If little offenses, from their minuteness, escape you, and the greatest, from their magnitude, oppress you, it is impossible that this form of trial should not in the end vanish out of the constitution. For we must not deceive ourselves; whatever does not stand with credit can not stand long. And, if the constitution should be deprived, I do not mean in form but virtually, of this resource, it is virtually deprived of everything else that is valuable in it. For this process is the cement which binds the whole together; this is the individuating principle that makes England what England is. In this court it is that no subject in no part of the Empire can fall of competent and proportionable justice; here it is that we provide for that which is the substantial excellence of our constitution; I mean the great circulation of responsibility by which (excepting the Supreme Power) no man, in no circumstances, can escape the account which he owes the laws of his country. It is by this process that magistracy, which tries and controls all other things, is itself tried and controlled. Other constitutions are satisfied with making good subjects; this is a security for good governors. It is by this tribunal that statesmen who abuse their power are accused by statesmen and tried by statesmen, not upon the niceties of a narrow jurisprudence, but upon the enlarged and solid principles of state morality. It is here that those who by the abuse of power have violated the spirit of law can never hope for protection from any of its forms; it is here that those who have refused to conform themselves to its perfections can never hope to escape through any of its defects.

It ought, therefore, my lords, to become our common care to guard this, your precious deposit, rare in its use, but powerful in its effect, with a religious vigilance, and never to suffer it to be either discredited or antiquated. For this great end your lordships are invested with great and plenary powers; but you do not suspend, you do not supersede, you do not annihilate, any subordinate jurisdiction; on the contrary, you are auxiliary and supplemental to them all.

I shall not take any further time of the House. I appreciate very much your consideration. I always feel complimented when I can get up in a conversational sort of way and talk to my colleagues of the House and hold their interest and attention. I appreciate very much having had that sort of attention in this connection. [Applause.]

WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 10381 to amend the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 10381, with Mr. MAPES in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 10381, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10381) to amend the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know how much time we have on general debate?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota has 2 hours and 11 minutes. The gentleman from Mississippi has 3 hours and 19 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Will the gentleman from Texas use some of this time?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. Mr. Chairman, I will yield myself 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen of the committee, in the beginning I will briefly outline the situation which confronted the World War Veterans' Legislation Committee in arriving at the making of the bill now before the House for consideration. At first I believe the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] introduced the bill last December which had for its object and purpose the liberalizing of the World War veterans' act of 1924, and on January 7, 1930, I think it was, the distinguished chairman of our committee, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON], introduced two bills, one to carry out the wishes of the organization known as the Disabled Veterans and the other to carry out the wishes of the American Legion.

Hearings were held on the Rankin bill, and after the hearings were held on the Rankin bill the two bills introduced by

the gentleman from South Dakota were taken up and hearings were held on those two bills. After the hearings the Democratic members were excluded and the majority members of the committee got together and decided on what is now known as the Johnson bill, now before the House for consideration.

If I were permitted to write a bill for the purpose of liberalizing the terms of the World War veterans' act of 1924, but restricted and limited by the requirement to show service-connected disability, I could not devise a better bill than the one now before the House, the Johnson bill. It goes just as far as possible for a bill to go without being a pension bill.

But let us not be confused into believing that this is a pension measure. Although we are writing legislation into the World War veterans' act which will considerably liberalize the terms of that original act, if liberally construed, still it will be necessary for the veteran who applies for relief to show that his disability is connected with his military service in the World War. We are under the terms of this bill providing a way whereby it is possible for 175,000 additional veterans to get relief. I hope it will go as far as is claimed. Yet if they have to go through the mass of red tape that may be required for them to go through, it must be said that a comparatively few thousand will secure relief. I will say now candidly that it will be possible under the terms of this bill for not many thousands to get relief. The Veterans' Bureau can make the requirements, limitations, and restrictions so strict and rigid that the veterans could not make the required proof.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. PERKINS. Is it not true that under the terms of the Johnson bill every disability of 10 per cent up to the year 1925 will be service connected?

Mr. PATMAN. That is true; and that is just as far as it is possible to carry the legislation, if it must be service connected. You are adopting a policy here that the proof must be service connected, but change the burden of proof and put the burden of proof on the Government, which will be easy for the Government to rebut in many deserving cases if the Veterans' Bureau is as diligent in trying to rebut these cases as it has been in the presumptive cases up to 1925.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. PERKINS. The Johnson bill will practically take care of 170,000 service cases; in fact, all of the border-line cases.

Mr. PATMAN. I will admit that the Johnson bill is as good a bill as could be written up to 1925 with service connection required.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. You will find in the Rankin bill this provision:

But in all cases such presumption shall be rebutted by clear and convincing evidence.

So that the two bills are exactly the same in that respect.

Mr. PATMAN. That is so. I would like to give my support to the Rankin bill. I would like to see the Rankin bill superimposed on the Johnson bill after 1925, but I believe the Johnson bill is better than the Rankin bill up to 1925. I think it is the best basis we can build this legislation on, but it does not go far enough. Up to 1925 it will not include more than 23,205 mental and nervous cases.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] mentioned tuberculosis cases and prayed for sympathy for them. The gentleman and I are both on the committee, and I know we have sympathy for them. Is it not true that already four laws have been passed which prefer tuberculosis cases above any other class of cases?

Mr. PATMAN. I think that is true, yes; if you want to refer to them as preferences.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. In the gentleman's opinion, is it possible that the Government can afford to pay men who have been afflicted with different diseases up to the present time a pension of \$225 or \$250 a month? That is, pension and hospitalization? Can the Government afford to pay that?

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] is speaking of exceptional cases. We should not make the exception a general rule, and we should not attempt to pass legislation based upon exceptions. We should pass legislation based upon the average case; the distinguished chairman of the committee certainly would not contend that would be the average case. The primary consideration is the need of the veterans.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. It would be of all hospitalization cases.

Mr. PATMAN. After all, he does not get \$120 a month for hospitalization. It is true the Government pays out that much money, but the veteran only gets \$80.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. The veteran gets \$80, plus allowances.

Mr. PATMAN. He gets \$80, plus allowances. Knowing the gentleman from South Dakota as I do, I know that he would not think of taking that amount away from the veterans in such a case. He has a wife and children to support. I know the gentleman from South Dakota would not deprive that soldier of the \$80 and allowances.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Certainly not; but the Government, in my judgment, can not, in perpetuity, pay this great body of service men, numbering 4,250,000, compensation and hospitalization which, in practically every case, will result in a payment by the Government to that service man for a certain period of \$225 to \$250 a month, because that would bankrupt the Government.

Mr. PATMAN. But the gentleman from South Dakota must remember that, for every dollar paid out in compensation, whether it is called a pension or compensation, there is a saving of \$2 or \$3 in hospitalization. Under the terms of the bill, a tubercular patient or a neuropsychiatric patient who can not show service connection before 1925 has every incentive in the world to go to a hospital. If he goes to a hospital and remains 30 days, which he will, on the thirty-first day he can make an affidavit that his total income, exclusive of all pensions and compensation from the Government, is less than \$1,000, and his family will receive compensation during his confinement and for two months after he gets out of the hospital. That creates an incentive for that class of men to go to the hospital. In other words, it is coaxing them into the hospitals of the country; whereas if they are paid a small pension of \$50 a month, it would save \$120 a month in hospitalization as well as the allowance to their families.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENISON. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] not think that that feature should commend it? Should not a man with tuberculosis go to a hospital?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; he should. If it is impossible for him to receive proper treatment at home.

Mr. DENISON. Then the feature of which the gentleman is speaking should commend the bill.

Mr. PATMAN. At the same time the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON] is speaking from the standpoint of the public health?

Mr. DENISON. From every standpoint, from the standpoint of the veteran himself, his family, and the public health. Since we take care of his family with a good pension the man should go to the hospital.

Mr. PATMAN. And from the standpoint of the public health it is promoting the general welfare, and if that is done the Government should pay for the expense. The Government should pay a man compensation just as has been done for disabilities prior to 1925.

Mr. PERKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. PERKINS. At the present time we are paying pensions to Civil War veterans, to veterans of the Spanish-American War, and we are paying compensation to World War veterans. Does the gentleman not think that the time has arrived when Congress or a committee of Congress should make a study of the treatment of service men and have one general rule applying to all ex-service men?

Mr. PATMAN. I agree with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PERKINS]. I think that policy should be adopted, and for that reason I am in favor of this limitation of three years in the present bill. This bill is not a permanent policy. As I understand, it will expire in three years; and we anticipate that during this time the committee of which the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PERKINS] speaks will have met and will have agreed upon some form of legislation that is just and reasonable for veterans of all wars, and will have submitted that to Congress and the Congress will have adopted it and we will have a permanent pension system for the veterans of all wars. For that reason I am heartily in favor of this provision of three years.

Before I go further into the presumptive clause I would like to say a few words about the support and assistance rendered to the committee by different individuals.

The distinguished chairman of our committee [Mr. JOHNSON] is to be congratulated for his sponsorship of this measure. The

gentleman, I believe, has the interest of the ex-service men at heart. The gentleman is going to do his very best for the men with whom he served during the World War. This is a much more liberal piece of legislation than I ever expected to come from the committee.

On the other hand, there is another gentleman, the ranking Democratic member [Mr. RANKIN], who has been very courageous in this fight. The gentleman has spent a lot of time and has worked very hard to try to have the World War veterans' act liberalized for the benefit of the veterans of the World War.

I believe the ex-service men of the country owe the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] a debt of gratitude for the work he has done.

I do not say this for the purpose of detracting from the assistance rendered by other members of the committee nor the assistance rendered by representatives of service organizations. I do not believe it would be possible for the American Legion, if they should search the entire United States, to find a better man to represent the wishes of the veterans of the World War than Mr. Watson B. Miller.

I do not believe it would be possible for the Disabled American Veterans, if they should search the entire United States, to find a better man to represent the wishes of that organization and the American people than Tom Kirby. I do not believe it would be possible for the Veterans of Foreign Wars, if they should search the entire 48 States of the United States and the District of Columbia, to find a better man to represent that organization and to carry out its wishes and promote the general welfare than Mr. Bettelheim. All of these gentlemen appeared before our committee and rendered such assistance as was possible for them to render, and without their assistance I am sure this bill would not have been nearly as satisfactory as it is written to-day and as sponsored by the chairman of the committee, Mr. JOHNSON.

With reference to the presumptive clause, the burden of proof, take, for instance, such a case as a man coming to the Veterans' Bureau in 1931 claiming disability on account of asthma. Under the provisions of the Johnson measure the Veterans' Bureau will say to the applicant, "If you can show that your disability was connected with the service before 1925, it is presumed that your disability is connected with the service. Can you show that?" He shows them that in 1924 he was examined by the very best physicians in the country and he has their affidavits to show that he was suffering from asthma in 1924, but the Veterans' Bureau can turn to their files and say, "Yes, Mr. Jones, it is true you were examined in 1924; you were suffering from asthma, but we have a record of where you applied for compensation in 1922 and you were examined by the bureau doctors at that time, and the bureau doctors probably examined you for another disability, but there is nothing to indicate that you were suffering from asthma or had any symptoms of asthma. Therefore under the act passed by Congress the bureau has rebutted your testimony by clear and convincing evidence and your claim must be refused."

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I have had a great deal of experience with the Veterans' Bureau. They require medical testimony. I remember one case which I fought for about five years. Finally, after the man died, his insurance was allowed. The man lived in the country away from a doctor, but the Veterans' Bureau at that time would not consider lay testimony. It had to be medical testimony. Is there anything in the present bill that cures that feature in any way?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; it is supposed to cure it; but, I will say frankly, I do not see where it will be any command to the Veterans' Bureau to carry out any particular policy of Congress. The law simply says that the Veterans' Bureau, in passing upon these claims, shall give due regard to lay affidavits. But, of course, that is very broad in its scope. The bureau could make such requirements as to lay affidavits, if it desired to do so, that this would not help matters the least bit in the world.

Further, with reference to connecting these cases. If the Johnson bill passes without extending the presumptive period to 1930 or without superimposing the Rankin bill on the Johnson bill from 1925 to 1930 or putting any amendment on the bill, you are going to leave out a class of cases that is really responsible for the enactment of this legislation. The cases we have heard so much about are the neuropsychiatric cases and the tuberculosis cases—the most pitiful cases of them all. I will not say they are more pitiful but they are just as pitiful as any could be. You will leave them out in the cold if you pass the Johnson bill as it is now.

There are 23,205 neuropsychiatric cases broken down since 1925. They have possibly been carrying on; they had good jobs; they were getting good salaries; and they were anxious to live

with their families. So they went ahead until after 1925, when they began to break down. If the Johnson bill passes as it is, these 23,205 cases will not get one penny of compensation. The only way in the world they can help their families is by going to a hospital and remaining there for more than 30 days. Then if they can make an affidavit that their incomes are less than \$1,000 a year their families can get a little support in that way. There are tubercular cases to the number of 18,986. If this bill passes like it is, it will leave those 18,986 cases out in the cold, so to speak. They will not receive one penny of compensation and they will not receive any benefits from the provisions of this law except that possibly they can go to a hospital, remain there for more than 30 days, and then make an affidavit that they have an income of less than \$1,000 a year, and then their families can receive a small sum in support. That is the only way on earth they can help their families, namely, by going to a Government hospital and staying there more than 30 days.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, being in charge of the time on the Democratic side at this time, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. PERKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. PERKINS. In further answer to the inquiry made by the gentleman from North Carolina, I would refer him to section 1 of the bill, which provides that the regulations relating to the nature and extent of the proofs and evidence shall provide that due regard shall be given to lay evidence and to other evidence not of a medical nature. I do not know how you can make it any broader.

Mr. PATMAN. I can not yield for a statement. I do not expect to use more than 30 minutes, and these interruptions are taking too much of my time. In reply to the gentleman from New Jersey, I will ask him, What does "due regard" mean? That is up to the bureau to say, is it not? They can make such rules as they want to make about due regard. The term can be construed to be meaningless.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. CONNERY. I did not hear the whole of the gentleman's statement, but is the gentleman in favor of the amendment which I am going to propose to bring the Johnson bill up to 1930?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, I will favor any amendment which will liberalize this legislation. I am in favor of the Johnson bill like it is up to 1925, and I am in favor of building it up as far as 1930 just as much as I can. Then, however, I do not believe it will include as many cases up to 1930 as it is represented it will include.

Mr. DUNBAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. DUNBAR. Under the provision read by the gentleman from New Jersey, would not anyone who has a neuropsychiatric case or a tuberculous case in 1925 or the year previous thereto be able to prove his case without going to a hospital?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, suppose he were to come into the bureau to submit his proof? The gentleman means a tuberculosis case?

Mr. DUNBAR. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. Of course, I presume the gentleman has received many replies from the bureau stating that although the examination showed that the one applying for compensation had tuberculosis at this time they found there was an examination made back in 1921 or 1922, when the applicant was in perfect health, and no signs of tuberculosis appeared. Therefore that is clear and convincing proof his disability is not connected with his service, and the claim is disallowed.

Mr. DUNBAR. As I understood the provision just read by the gentleman from New Jersey, a tuberculosis case would be presumed to be service connected if in 1924 he were able to prove he had tuberculosis.

Mr. PATMAN. Or 1925.

Mr. DUNBAR. Nineteen hundred and twenty-four.

Mr. PATMAN. In 1925 under the Johnson bill.

Mr. DUNBAR. Then under the Johnson bill a man who had tuberculosis in 1924 can receive compensation?

Mr. PATMAN. Absolutely. Service presumption of tuberculosis, spinal meningitis, paresis, permanently helpless cases, and bedridden cases are not rebuttable.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. BRIGGS. I want to ask the gentleman if it is not true that neuropsychiatric cases are more on the increase than any others?

Mr. PATMAN. I think heart diseases are more on the increase now than any other disability. I have the information

here some place, and I believe heart diseases are more on the increase; in fact, they have doubled the tuberculosis cases.

Mr. BRIGGS. And the neuropsychiatric cases, which make up one of the largest elements of increase, are expressed in terms of insanity and dementia præcox, and these men, for instance, after the 1st of January, 1925, who become afflicted with insanity, will have no means of establishing their cases with their own testimony.

Mr. PATMAN. That is very true. I shall not yield to anyone else at this time. I want to tell you something about how difficult it is for a soldier to connect his case with the service under the present law. All of you have had experience in attempting to do that and possibly much more experience than I have had, although I have tried to help the soldiers ever since this law was passed. We will take a soldier who gets affidavits from his physician who has examined him ever since he has been out of the service. This physician makes an affidavit which shows clearly and convincingly that the soldier is afflicted with tuberculosis or any other disease. Well, what does the bureau do? And if the bureau is just one-half as diligent in the future, if this bill is passed, as it has been in the past, it is going to rebut about two-thirds of those cases. They will send an agent down to see the doctor who made the affidavit. The agent will say, "You made an affidavit and I want to see your book." He asks to see the book in which the doctor made a notation at the time showing he made such an examination. Well, maybe the doctor says he did not keep any books. Then the agent of the bureau says, "We can not take that. You have no record that is clear and convincing proof and which backs up what you have said. We can not give weight to your statement." Although the doctor is telling the truth and can corroborate his statement by other facts, his affidavit is not given consideration because he has not kept the proper books showing the examination of the veteran.

I know of one case where the doctor had a record, but it was a loose-leaf or a card-index system. He was a railroad doctor and he used the card-index system, and the bureau's agent even criticized that and said it was a loose-leaf system, was not recorded in a bound book, and therefore intimated that it should not be given the credence and should not be accepted with the same reliance as if he had put it in a book that was not a loose-leaf or card system, or one that could not be detached. We know there are proper tests to be made to determine accurately whether a patient has tuberculosis, but a doctor, probably not getting a fee for his services, but is doing the work as a matter of accommodation, and, consequently, he is not going to the trouble and the expense of making a sputum test or sending the sputum to be tested in some hospital in a distant city, and then pay the bill himself for the purpose of aiding the soldier.

It is not expected of the doctor. Although the medical profession has been very considerate of the wants and needs of ex-service men, doctors can not be expected to do everything that the bureau claims they should have done. Consequently, the soldiers' records are incomplete. These cases, my friends, are the border-line cases. They are the cases of patients who are afflicted with tuberculosis, and they are service-connected cases if the proof could be found or if true records had been properly kept, but they have not been so kept and therefore they can not connect their disabilities with the service.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Is it not a fact that practically all the men who will benefit under the Rankin bill have already filed a claim for compensation and the claim has been denied?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not want to discuss that phase of the matter just now.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I am making that statement in order to lead up to the question I have in mind. The bureau will be in a position to use the evidence now in the files in order to rebut the claim of the soldier when he files his claim if the Johnson bill or the Rankin bill becomes the law.

Mr. PATMAN. I am glad the gentleman has suggested that, and I thank him for his contribution.

There should be some amendment to the bill providing that the record heretofore made against any soldier should not be used against him when he seeks benefits under this law. If you do not do this, you are going to destroy the purpose of the legislation.

There is one way you can place the poor and the unfortunate on a parity with the rich and the well informed, and that is to give each of them the benefit of the same kind of counsel or counsel of equal ability. Congress has denied the poor and uninformed soldiers of this country a chance to be placed on a parity with the influential and those who are informed about the

law by refusing them the right to employ counsel, except for an insignificant fee. A poor, uninformed soldier goes into a lawyer's office with a large bundle of papers under his arm relating to his case. Do you think that lawyer is going to take the case and the interest in his case that he would take if he were permitted to charge a reasonable fee? He can not pay the lawyer more than a \$10 fee. Although the lawyers have been very good to ex-service men they can not be expected to give the same care and attention to a case without a fee as they would give for a reasonable fee. To properly work up many of these cases a lawyer is required to spend considerable money for traveling expenses, and other purposes. I know of cases where lawyers spent several times the \$10 allowed in actual expenses helping the soldiers. Many lawyers render their very valuable and faithful services without charge. The veterans in many instances have not had the services of skilled help in preparing their papers for submission to the Veterans' Bureau. Mistakes and errors have crept in the files and are now being held against the interest of the veterans, and causing them to be denied compensation. If you are now going to use that poorly prepared and loosely drawn evidence against these soldiers you are going to destroy the benefits of this legislation.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CONNERY. Along the lines of what the gentleman was saying a moment ago, was it not brought out at the hearings that even under the present law in cases of active tuberculosis the country physicians have not the facilities or the instruments to make the sputum tests which are required by the bureau to prove active tuberculosis?

Mr. PATMAN. That is absolutely correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five more minutes.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. I want to ask the gentleman a question that is perhaps not very material to the issue here, but why does the gentleman say that if the soldier goes to a lawyer to have him prepare his case he does not take any interest in it?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not say he does not take any interest in it.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. That is what I understood the gentleman to say, and I regard the statement a reflection on the bar.

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, no. I am a member of the bar myself. And besides I do not care to reflect on the bar.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. The gentleman made that statement just now.

Mr. PATMAN. I did not intend to make the statement that a lawyer would not take any interest. I said probably he would not take the interest he would take if he were getting a reasonable fee, and I believe the gentleman will agree with what I have said.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. I do not agree with the gentleman and I am glad the gentleman has modified what I understand was his statement.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Will the gentleman tell me what percentage of the 18,000 tuberculosis patients have been drawing compensation under the statutory award, that under the decision of the Comptroller General have had their service connection broken because activity had not been shown?

Mr. PATMAN. There are others here better informed on that question, I will say to the gentleman from Georgia, than I am and I would rather they would speak on that. I do not have the accurate figures before me.

There is one other proposition I want to mention before concluding.

The medical records were not properly kept, at least they were not sufficiently kept during the period of the national emergency and there are 15,000,000 pieces of paper, as explained to you by our distinguished chairman the other day, scattered all over the United States in different hospitals, and if this legislation passes all this evidence will be brought together here in Washington and compiled for the purpose of assisting veterans who have been clamoring for relief ever since they were discharged from the service. It has been reported that they did not have a medical record of any kind in the Army or that there was no notation made with reference to certain disabilities suffered by them when, in truth and in fact, the notations were properly made, but the records and the documents and papers, including such information, have not been sent to Washington and com-

plied or arranged alphabetically so it could be properly used and the information promptly given.

I thank the members of the committee for their good attention. [Applause.]

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CAMPBELL].

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the House, to-day I stand between two fires. On one side is what I would like to do; on the other side is what I ought to do. We realize that this Government of ours, through its respective Congresses, have been exceptionally liberal to the ex-service men of the World War. This has been due not only to the hearts of our people but also our national finance.

It has been argued here on the floor of this House that it was long after the Civil War before pensions were granted to the Federal veterans of that war, and that it was long after the Spanish-American War before the veterans of that war received their just dues. This is all true, but, Mr. Chairman, let us review for a moment the conditions of our country during those periods.

The Civil War was a war among our own people, in which millions of dollars of property was destroyed and millions of debts created. These debts were owed largely to foreign lands. The South was bankrupt and the North was badly crippled. Following the Spanish-American War our national income was around twenty to twenty-five billions. How different from the condition that we emerged from the World War.

We came out of the last war the richest nation in all the world, with the other nations owing us billions of dollars. If we were to figure by dollars and cents the real profits that came from the last engagement, we would find that those profits not only covered the years of the war but have extended to this Nation in all the years that have followed.

We of all nations were in a financial condition and in an industrial condition to immediately send out our lines of communication and get in touch with the trade of the world. Our commerce with the countries south of us has expanded by leaps and bounds. We immediately assembled our plants in mass production; our goods poured out of our ports to practically every nation in the world. Our balance of trade has brought to us from \$500,000,000 to close to \$1,000,000,000 a year. We have sent our money out in the form of loans to countries and municipalities to the amount of over \$10,000,000,000. Many have grown rich during this prosperous period, and especially has this been so in regard to the kings of industry. Millionaires and multimillionaires have grown up on every side, and, as has been stated on this floor before, 496 persons now enjoy an income of over \$1,000,000 a year. This number has grown but recently from 268 to the number before mentioned.

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. LUCE. So that I may at this moment insert the fact that up to the 30th of June, last, we had spent for the veterans \$3,899,272,291.53.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. Yes; and I think that is a wonderful thing. I am a member of the American Legion and also a member of the World War Veterans' Committee. We are proud of our country. We are proud of that fact, and I hope the gentleman will not for a minute think that I am saying that we have done nothing for the World War veterans.

Mr. PERKINS. Will the gentleman yield further at this point?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. PERKINS. For something else to be proud about. Under present existing law, between the present time and 1940, this country is committed to expend \$6,000,000,000 more for the ex-service men of the World War.

Mr. CONNERY. And, if the gentleman will yield for something else to be proud about, so far as the \$3,877,000,000 is concerned. It is much better to be able to pay to the soldiers of the United States than it would have been to be paying it to Germany, is not that so?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. Oh, I agree with all of you gentlemen, so far as that is concerned.

The American standard of living has been raised, and the only question now is just how far we can go in taking care of the disabled soldiers.

Mr. Chairman, I have no criticism to offer to those members of the committee or the Members of the House who disagree with me. I am not to-day laying claim to a bigger heart or a more sympathetic attitude than any Member here, but I do feel that the American people are anxious and ready to aid to the fullest extent those who have offered their lives for the sake of their country.

We have done well toward those who have been able to prove service connection, but there is not a woman or man within the sound of my voice who has not had her or his trouble when it comes to prove that connection. I feel, as do many of you, that the members of the Veterans' Bureau, under the instructions as given them by General Hines, the director, could have gone further in taking in the consideration of lay evidence than they have in the past, as shown by the records.

Mr. Chairman, I approve the passage of the resolution by which a committee can be appointed to work out the injustices, and to provide for fair and honest treatment to all the soldiers. Let us stand face to face with the fact that we are shortly coming to a pension for the soldiers who suffer disabilities; in fact, the Johnson bill is but a pension in its form, but the thing that bothers me is what shall I do toward bringing relief to those who are without the pale of the Johnson bill, or rather those who have broken down in health since the year 1925.

Can I go home and face my bedridden comrade, destitute and suffering in his bed of pain? Are we to say that the lapse of time has been too short since the World War to take care of him and his beloved ones?

If it is a question of money, then, let us take the maximum amount that can be approved by the President, and let us scatter it out as far as possible.

Mr. Chairman, if two destitute men came to my door asking aid, and if in my humble dwelling I had but one loaf of bread, would I give that loaf to the one man and tell the other to go out into the world and starve? Mr. Chairman, I would do exactly as you would do. I would take my carving knife, I would cut that loaf as near as possible straight in the middle, and to each man would be given one-half of that loaf of bread.

We have before us here, the chairman says, and he perhaps is right, a certain amount of money. By his bill we are going to give the greater amount to those who are not service connected, but whose disabilities have occurred before 1925. Mr. Chairman, I am going to offer an amendment to that bill, and that amendment will read as follows:

I move to amend section 10 by striking out the figures "1925" in line 11 on page 14, and line 1 on page 15, and insert in lieu thereof the figures "1930"; and to add to said paragraph after the word "Congress" in the eighth line on page 15, the following: "And further provided, That where service connection is granted solely by virtue of this act, that the compensation to be paid shall be on a basis of 50 per cent of the compensation heretofore allowed for like disabilities."

It looks to me under the circumstances that that is the only fair way to do.

Mr. Chairman, I belong to one of the greatest organizations in this country—the American Legion. This organization, together with other organizations of its kind, has fought a wonderful fight for their disabled comrades. Iowa has produced great leaders in this movement. The heads of the organization in my home State have faithfully performed their part of the duty. Their positions have enabled them to study these veteran measures better than I. I feel that I must, in a way, at this time as a new Member of Congress, and having been but a short time in this work, be controlled by their desires.

I have received two telegrams, both from the Legion heads, as well as that of the auxiliary, in which they asked me not to jeopardize the great benefits in the Johnson bill by supporting the advancement of the date of presumptive evidence from 1925 to 1930. I know well what is in their hearts; I know that if they could feel that 1930 would not jeopardize this bill in its final enactment that they would be heartily in favor of the measure. But, Mr. Speaker, this is the middle of April; this bill is to pass the House and the Senate; it then goes to the President for his signature; if it should be vetoed I doubt if there would be any legislation of this kind which would pass this Congress and be signed by the President.

In the cases that I have the Johnson bill will cover many of them, but I shall not be satisfied until something is done for all of the destitute disabled veterans.

The other day the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] told you of a pitiful case down in his own district. A case with which the chairman of the committee was familiar. I noticed at that time, when the gentleman told us of this case, tears came into his eyes. Knowing him as I do I wish to say that those tears did not come from his eyes but they came from his heart.

I have before me the record of a young man who was in perfect health when he enlisted on February 26, 1918. He was honorably discharged on June 10, 1919. While in the service he was treated for measles, scarlet fever, infection of the hip, and hospitalized as a meningitis suspect. The affidavits show he was suffering from influenza and diarrhea, although the record in the Army is silent as to these last two diseases. A

short time after leaving the Army it was found he was unable to work; he tried to farm, and at last he gave up his work, and to-day is totally disabled, living with his wife's parents in Canada.

Another case is a man in about the same condition. He filed his claim for compensation on September 4, 1924. The bureau found that he had valvular heart disease, a scar from an appendicitis operation, with adhesive complications; that he has neurocirculatory asthenia. This case, however, I take it, would be covered by the Johnson bill.

I have another case of a man who has given up his professional practice, has gone to live with a relative. He writes a very pitiful letter in which he states that he has given up all hope, and that life does not interest him. In this case claimant furnished affidavits to show that he entered the service in splendid physical condition; that when he was discharged he had evidence of tuberculosis and deafness, and that he is still suffering from that disease. Within three months after his discharge he took up his case with the authorities and they found that he had tuberculosis. He was allowed \$40 per month, although he had evidence to show that he was totally disabled. He was re-examined, and his compensation taken from him. Through my efforts he was but lately hospitalized, and his case is again pending. His nerves are shattered, is practically deaf, and evidence shows that he is still suffering from tuberculosis. I could continue along this line with numerous cases, but I know that all of you Congressmen have the same complaint, and I am not going to burden the records with like uncompensated cases.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Does the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Of course I am not familiar with all of the facts in the case, but I should judge that a good many of those things could be chargeable to the service, but regardless of that fact it is true that the bill before the committee would operate to take care of this young man.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. I am glad to know that under this bill that there is every chance in the world that it will take care of these poor fellows. But what are you going to do when you go back home for the fellow that has broken down since 1925?

Life looks dark to these boys. It simply means that they and their families must be taken care of either by the local American Legion, the Red Cross, or eventually to be sent to the poorhouse.

Mr. Chairman, war is a terrible thing. As Sherman said, "War is hell." When a Government assumes the responsibility, as often they must, of defending their national honor and the principles of humanity, the people of that Nation should and must pay the cost of the conflict.

I have heard many say that a great portion of these young men came out of the war strong and healthy, but, Mr. Chairman, the results of that war will never be shown in the first few years following the same. Nervous diseases, consumption, cancer, and many others which came from that service, will show themselves in years to come.

As the people of America bid the boys Godspeed as they left their homes and their firesides to go out and face death, they vowed in their souls that nothing would be too good for those that returned.

I am proud of my State; I am proud of the fact that as a member of the State Legislature of Iowa I voted for submission to the people of my State a provision providing that they should vote on a bond issue of \$22,000,000 to pay in a small way the service men who enlisted from my Commonwealth.

I am more than proud of her people who walked into the secrecy of the ballot box and there in overwhelming numbers cast their vote in favor of that bond issue. It was the first time, I believe, that the State of Iowa issued bonds; and although during those years our people were hard hit financially yet they were willing to give a share of what they had in compliance with the vows that they had made during the days when the dark clouds of war were hovering over our fair land.

The clamor of war is over. Over 10 years has elapsed, but their hearts have not hardened nor their purse strings tied.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. CONNERY. Do the World War veterans and the members of the American Legion fear that you would overload the bill?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. CONNERY. That is the old saw that we have been having here about overloading the bill, and that the President of the United States will veto it. I do not believe that the Presi-

dent of the United States will veto any bill that Congress would put up to him.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. I am afraid you are wrong. I have had instructions from those whose hearts are just as big and broad as your heart, and they have worked for their comrades from the day they got out of the Army. I know those boys and I know the work they have done there.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Can you tell me how many persons in your State have had the service connection broken because of the activity shown by the comptroller?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. I have not the number of cases.

Mr. BRIGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. BRIGHAM. Can the gentleman give us an estimate of what this amendment would cost?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. It would advance the time from 1925 to 1930. I do not think my amendment will cost as much as the present bill.

Mr. BRIGHAM. I hope the gentleman will insert his amendment in the Record so that we can have it before us for examination.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. I will ask the unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to place that amendment in the Record for the reason that I may not have drawn it correctly. I know what I expected to do, but I want every Member to know when he looks it over just exactly what it means.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. There is now pending an amendment well drawn, inserted in the Record last week by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. The gentleman from Ohio gives 60 per cent up to 1925, and then takes in the tubercular cases to 1930 in the full ratio.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The amendment of the gentleman from Ohio is so drawn that it qualifies the presumption in favor of the veteran from 1925 to 1930 in reference to T. B. cases.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. Yes; that is the difference between his amendment and mine. I wanted to cover the whole field.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The gentleman's idea is to take it up to 1930?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. Yes; I wanted to take my buddies right up to 1930.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. The gentleman's idea is not to prefer one disease over another?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. That is it exactly.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. The gentleman from Iowa made the statement that the men in the higher class might in the future be brought down. In this bill (H. R. 10381) is a provision that the rates paid under this presumption are to continue for only three years. There is no vested right in them whatever. I will not vote for a pension of \$225 or \$250 a month for nonservice-connected cases.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. I am not going to take up the further time of this House for the reason that I expect again to speak when I submit my amendment, but, Mr. Speaker, let me say this in conclusion: That I feel it an honor to serve on the World War Veterans' Legislation Committee. I have known our chairman, ROYAL C. JOHNSON, of South Dakota, since we were young men just out of college. I have watched his career in the Congress of the United States as well as his service in behalf of his country. In that service he has seen the front-line trenches; he carries to-day the scars of battle. [Applause.]

His position is a hard one, but I know that his heart is with his buddies. I have received letters of censure from service men in regard to my colleagues of the committee; they have been very unfair, but I have looked upon them in a different light than if they should come from one in the prime of life and in the enjoyment of health. When we are sick the world does not look bright to us. We see the clouds and not the sunshine, and I forgive them and hope that some day they may know that down here in the Halls of Congress are women and men that look forward to the day when we may place these men on a reasonable compensation to in a small way recompense them for the services which they rendered their country in the hour of need and in support of the flag under which they fought.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The record shows that the veterans now receiving compensation are receiving, on an average, \$43 a month. Is that correct?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. The testimony before the committee was that they were receiving \$43 a month, on the average. If these men are cut down to 50 per cent of that amount, it will leave a little less than \$22 a month; possibly \$21.75 per month for the tubercular and neuropsychiatric cases. Does the gentleman not think that is too small for men suffering as the tubercular men are, to sustain themselves in their present unfortunate condition?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. In answer to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] I will say he is right in that part, but the gentleman is a little wrong in regard to the proportions. In other words, when a man is totally disabled and bedridden he will get a higher amount than one-half of \$40.

Mr. RANKIN. I agree with the gentleman from Iowa, that the higher the degree of disability the more money the man will receive. Is it not a fact that a great many of the best soldiers we had came back from the Army thinking they were all right, resisting all importunities to apply for compensation, and attempted to carry on until after 1925, when they finally broke down and are now suffering from tuberculosis, and who are just as deserving and whose disabilities are just as much due to the service as a great many who have been on the roll all the time? Does the gentleman not think that the tubercular men at least should receive full compensation instead of being reduced 50 per cent?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. As I said before, I have no argument with the gentleman on this point. In my town I know a man who came out of the Army with stomach trouble. He was suffering from stomach trouble from the day he got out of the Army. He finally reached the stage where ulcers had perforated his intestines and he had to be taken immediately to the hospital and be operated upon. That simply shows the type of man he was. There are hundreds of that class of men.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that my amendment may pass, that the benefits, although small, may reach out into each soldier's home which is to-day darkened by sickness and pain. But, Mr. Chairman, if this amendment should fail, I shall support the Johnson bill for there is no question that it goes a long way to alleviate the sufferer, and I am afraid that if I should vote for the extension of time for presumptive disability to 1930 that the financial weight will be so heavy that the bill will not become a law. [Applause.]

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DUNBAR]. [Applause.]

Mr. DUNBAR. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am not one of those who believe that the United States has done wonderful things for the soldiers of the World War. I do not believe we have been parsimonious, but I do believe we pat ourselves too much and congratulate ourselves too much for what we have doled out to them for their inestimable efforts in behalf of this Republic. [Applause.]

Certain underlying causes, among them our national integrity, were given for our entering the World War, which preserved our Nation and incidentally piled up billions of dollars of wealth for those who remained at home. The mere pittance of \$5,000,000,000 which we have paid to them, and which has been referred to by some of the Members of this body with so much pride, is nothing but a drop in the bucket as compensation to them for what they did for us.

I am first for the financial integrity of the Nation, and then I am in favor of paying compensation and providing for World War veterans in keeping with the amount we have in order to preserve our financial integrity. We can do so and provide handsomely for World War veterans.

I do not like the way we approach the passage of legislation for the "benefit" of the soldier. From what is said on the floor of the House it would appear that they are but mere beneficiaries of our charity and that we congratulate ourselves like the philanthropist who has made a world of money and then after dispensing a small amount of it for alms pats himself on the back and says, "Well done, good and faithful servant." So I do not like the way we approach what we do for the World War soldiers.

On page 17 of the report is this language:

Giving weight to the uncertain factors as to which no definite estimate is possible, it is expected that this bill will add at least \$100,000,000 a year to the annual appropriations, now amounting to about \$500,000,000.

Now, mark this:

For the "benefit" of veterans of the World War and their dependents.

How can we give them any benefit for what they have done for us? Rather should that have read:

For aid and partial payment, small though it may be, to the veterans of the World War and their dependents.

What is the meaning of the word "benefit"? The word "benefit" means "profit."

Mr. PERKINS. The word "benefit" does not mean "profit." It comes from two Latin words which mean "make good."

Mr. DUNBAR. You look in your dictionary and you will find that the word "benefit" means "profit." Where did you get your information?

Mr. PERKINS. Well, I studied a little bit of Latin once.

Mr. DUNBAR. Are you acquainted with any American dictionary?

Mr. PERKINS. I have seen one.

Mr. DUNBAR. Do you want to carry us back to the days of the Caesars, and to the days of the Coliseum, when men had to fight wild beasts—and gave up the ghost?

Mr. PERKINS. No.

Mr. DUNBAR. Why do you not Americanize yourself on this bill which we propose for the benefit of our soldiers? [Laughter and applause.] The gentleman should find out the meaning of the words put in that bill. If you want Latin or Greek, put it in there.

Mr. PERKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUNBAR. Yes.

Mr. PERKINS. I think the term used by the gentleman who drafted the committee report was as practical and as sensible as any word that could be used to express the meaning of the committee. We can never pay these men. The gentleman suggests partial payment. We can never pay the ex-service men but we can do something to benefit them.

Mr. DUNBAR. Which will be partial payment.

Mr. PERKINS. No; it does not mean that. You can not pay for flesh and blood and human anguish in dollars. [Applause.] For that reason the words "partial payment" were not put in there. But it does benefit these ex-service men a little bit to receive something from their Government.

Mr. DUNBAR. A little bit.

Mr. PERKINS. Yes; I will admit a little bit. I will also admit you can never compensate these men. The word "compensation" is wrongly used when you speak of these ex-service men, because you can never compensate them for what they suffered.

Mr. DUNBAR. I did not yield to the gentleman for a speech.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman yielded to me for a little Latin.

Mr. DUNBAR. Well, we have gotten very little knowledge and very little benefit from his Latin. In the American dictionary the word "benefit" means "profit"; it means advantage; it means the promotion of wealth and prosperity; it means a benefaction, a deed of kindness. I would like to know where any of the soldiers of the World War are going to get any profit out of this proposed legislation by reason of having served in the World War.

Mr. PERKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUNBAR. For a question.

Mr. PERKINS. Does the gentleman mean to say that the word "benefit" has all of the implications of the word "benefit" in the dictionary? No. It has a limited meaning. It means simply to give a slight advantage.

Mr. DUNBAR. No; it does not mean to give a slight advantage. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. PERKINS. It means making a small payment, not as compensation but by way of benefit to the ex-service men.

Mr. DUNBAR. I will take the American Dictionary, and I will call the gentleman's attention to the fact that it does not mean what he says it means. Now, it is said we spend \$500,000,000 a year for the benefit of our World War soldiers. That is the language used; but we do not spend \$500,000,000 a year for their benefit, so called.

In the message of the President transmitted through the Bureau of the Budget, we find there was expended during the year for the Veterans' Bureau \$581,000,000. Of this amount there was paid to soldiers for "benefits" which they received, the amount of \$189,000,000 for military and naval compensation. There was paid for medical and hospital services \$29,000,000. This makes a total of approximately \$230,000,000. Two hundred and thirty million dollars out of five hundred and eighty-one millions dollars is all that the veterans received.

It is true that military insurance amounted to \$115,000,000, which is counted as a part of this expenditure, but of that \$115,000,000 there was more than \$60,000,000 paid by the soldiers to the Government in order that they might be the beneficiaries of this insurance.

Then in addition to this, there is the adjusted-service compensation fund amounting to \$111,000,000. I claim this adjusted-compensation fund should not be regarded as a "benefit" to our soldiers, because it was only an amount of money voted to them as partial payment for incomplete compensation rendered to the soldiers for their activities in the World War.

But, Members of the House, it is a fact that out of \$581,000,000 appropriated last year for the United States Veterans' Bureau, the military and naval compensation, as well as the medical and hospital compensation, amounted to only \$230,000,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield there for a question?

Mr. DUNBAR. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. It is true, is it not, that out of the total appropriations made for these purposes, hospitalization, adjusted compensation, disability compensation, hospitals, and so forth, all but 3.7 per cent go for the service men. In other words, there is only 3.7 per cent of overhead; is not that true?

Mr. DUNBAR. Medical and hospital services or military and naval insurance amount to \$115,000,000, and that is 20 per cent of the entire appropriation. There is more than the gentleman's 3 per cent in this one item.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. If the gentleman will pardon me, I think we can straighten this question out, and I believe the gentleman is wrong. That comes under the old war-risk insurance, which has, or will, cost the Government \$1,300,000,000, and these payments are going to these old war-risk insurance boys who get total disability, and therefore receive these payments of \$57.50 per month. They paid all the expense except \$1,300,000,000, which was a Government gratuity.

Mr. DUNBAR. Does the gentleman mean to say that military and naval insurance of \$115,000,000 is not money that is appropriated for the purpose of providing a fund to pay the insurance which will fall due in some years hence?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Why, certainly. As the gentleman will recall, we had the old war-risk insurance that was given at a very, very low rate, so low that the men themselves paid only enough so that the total will cost the Government \$1,300,000,000 in addition to what the men will pay. So it is to that extent a gratuity.

Mr. DUNBAR. At the end of what time?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. At the end of the time we are done with the lawsuits, and we are practically done with them now.

Mr. DUNBAR. Then this \$115,000,000—

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Is a part of that and goes to the totally disabled men.

Mr. DUNBAR. That is more than 3 per cent.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. But that is not overhead. The overhead is only 3.7 per cent. In other words, 3.7 per cent goes to salaries, which is overhead.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman from Indiana yield right there?

Mr. DUNBAR. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from South Dakota is entirely wrong about that.

Mr. DUNBAR. Then let me answer the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. The salaries in the Veterans' Bureau amount to more than \$40,000,000, and that is more than 5 per cent of the amount appropriated.

Mr. DUNBAR. It is almost 10 per cent.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. The gentleman is talking there about the doctors in the hospitals, which is an entirely different thing from overhead.

Mr. DUNBAR. I may say to the gentleman that I will admit he knows more about Veterans' Bureau legislation than I do, but I do not accept his statements because I do not think they figure out properly.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Has the gentleman read the hearings?

Mr. DUNBAR. Only part of them.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Well, this is in the hearings.

Mr. DUNBAR. Oh, there are a great many things in the hearings that I have read that I do not approve of, and I do not believe that the persons who made the statements themselves knew what they were talking about.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. What statements does the gentleman refer to? I may agree with the gentleman.

Mr. DUNBAR. I read in the hearings that the Rankin bill will only increase the cost \$40,000,000; does the gentleman agree with that statement?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Certainly not, because that is an impossibility.

Mr. DUNBAR. That is one of them that I referred to.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUNBAR. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from South Dakota talks about the overhead being 3.7 per cent. Of course, I do not know what the dictionary on the other side of the House would include as overhead, but I do know that the salaries in the Veterans' Bureau outside of the hospitals amount to \$21,000,000 a year, and that is more than 4 per cent of the total amount appropriated.

Mr. DUNBAR. Does the gentleman suppose there is a difference in the definition of overhead as between a Latin dictionary and an American dictionary? [Laughter.]

Mr. RANKIN. I have never seen the dictionary used by the steering committee over there and I do not know what language is used by them. [Laughter.]

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUNBAR. I yield.

Mr. HASTINGS. While we are injecting figures in here to show the amount of money paid annually and the amount paid in toto to the ex-service men, let me remind the House of the settlement with the foreign governments of \$10,705,000,000, according to the statement of the Treasury Department. If I understand the gentleman from Indiana right, he is more in favor of being generous to the ex-service men at home than to the foreign governments.

Mr. DUNBAR. At least equally so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. I yield the gentleman 15 minutes more.

Mr. DUNBAR. The gentleman who has just spoken to us says that we are liberal with the European creditor but not liberal with our own soldiers. I want to say that I agree with him. You take the settlement of our debt with France and it has been heralded all over the land and all over the world that France has discharged its obligation to the United States. To what extent did she discharge her obligation to the United States? If France had commenced in 1925 to pay the Government 2½ per cent interest on the amount of money she owed us and paid that for 62 years, then the proposition which we accepted from France would be equivalent to our cancelling the debt at that time.

So France does not pay us one dollar principal of the amount of money that she owes us. On the other hand, we are giving France the benefit in the interest which she pays between 2½ per cent and 3½ per cent, which is being paid by the Government of Great Britain.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUNBAR. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I do not like to inject these debt settlements into this discussion, but it was brought up by the gentleman from Oklahoma. I was a Member of the House in 1917, and the gentleman from Oklahoma who has injected this into the debate says that that money was loaned to the country, and I want to say that it was loaned without a note or a promise to pay. There was not one note or a promise to pay given in the Wilson administration. I know that we are never going to collect the settlements that we did make.

Mr. HASTINGS. If the gentleman will permit, when the loan was advanced we loaned our credit to the foreign governments, and these foreign governments said that they would pay us in toto not only the amount loaned but the amount with interest that we were paying on the loans, which was then 4½ per cent. It was stated here on the floor of this House again and again that every single, solitary dollar of that money and interest would be paid. I remember well that Speaker Champ Clark stated over and over again that no government had ever defaulted in payment to another government.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. The Secretary of the Treasury in the Wilson administration was Mr. McAdoo, and I challenge the gentleman from Oklahoma to bring before the House one note or promise to pay taken from any one of those countries.

Mr. HASTINGS. The gentleman from South Dakota well knows that the amount of money loaned in the Wilson administration has not been challenged, and that is not a question at issue.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. But nobody can produce a note given by one of these foreign governments.

Mr. HASTINGS. The gentleman from South Dakota can debate it in that way, because the amount has never been challenged.

Mr. DUNBAR. The gentleman from South Dakota said that he did not want to bring politics into the debate.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. And I did not bring it in.

Mr. DUNBAR. But the gentleman participated in it.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUNBAR. I yield.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Although, of course, there will always be the question of whether those debt settlements will be lived up to, however, if carried out on the basis of these settlements I say that, extending over a period of 62 years, we will have this result, that Great Britain will have paid every penny of the principal with interest at somewhat over 3 per cent, France every penny with interest at a little over 2 per cent, and that Italy will have paid every dollar of principal with interest at about 1½ per cent.

Mr. DUNBAR. I admit Great Britain is our only large debtor who intends faithfully to discharge its war obligations.

Mr. HASTINGS. Yes; and Italy is extended over a period of 62 years, and for the first 10 years she pays nothing, and then she starts at one-eighth of 1 per cent and, with the gentleman's permission, let me state that if you count the time that this is extended from and the amount of interest that we collect, instead of the 4¼ per cent that we pay on our Liberty bonds you will find that we lose, according to the statement that I have had put into the RECORD a dozen times, made by the Treasury Department, \$10,705,000,000.

Mr. DUNBAR. That is absolutely correct, and it can be proven by statements and the records obtained from the Treasury Department, and I say to the gentleman that the statement that France will have paid back every dollar of principal is not true, that the gentleman has been misinformed, that if he was properly informed he would find out that the statement of Mr. Mellon or some one equal in authority will bear out the assertion that I have made, that if France would pay us 2½ per cent interest for 62 years, she would not pay one dollar of her debt.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. And I contradict the gentleman just as much as he contradicts me, and I stand on my assertion.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am interested in this discussion of the debt settlement, but that has passed the stage in the House where it is under discussion. I am more interested now in the gentleman's viewpoint as to his attitude on this pending legislation. He has been diverted in his discussion of the question and I would like to have him now return to that and tell the House before he is again diverted exactly what he would do if this legislation were up to him now?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. DUNBAR. Yes.

Mr. KETCHAM. But first let the gentleman tell the House what he would do if this matter were put up to him. I am interested in his interpretation of what it would be wise for the House to do now?

Mr. DUNBAR. I would vote to extend the provisions of the Johnson bill for five years. I will vote to add the Rankin bill, if the Johnson bill is not extended for five years, and supplement it for an additional five years. I will vote for either one of the measures which would extend it for an additional three years, pending which time there should be a scientific investigation as to the best means for this Government to treat all of its former soldiers. That is how I stand. Then, if I can not get that, I will gladly vote for the Johnson bill, and congratulate him on having at least done much for the ex-service man, but still not what they deserve and not what the gentleman thinks in his own heart they deserve. I fully believe that after Mr. JOHNSON has enacted this legislation for the benefit of the soldiers, which will be a long step forward, in his own soul he will immediately begin to think of some way by which he can function so as to bring the soldiers a greater amount of justice for the services they have rendered and for which in our treatment we have so neglected them.

I know Congressman JOHNSON, and he will do it. He was a man who resigned his seat in Congress and went to the front to fight as a private. He was wounded in action. That is the kind of a man he is. He sympathizes with the soldiers a great deal more than his bill indicates. [Applause.]

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to the gentleman for this very clear outline of what he would do. I was afraid that he was not going to be permitted to put in his own interpretation of his own attitude.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUNBAR. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. I just want to make this statement in answer to the gentleman from South Dakota who said that the United States Government had no note or I O U for the moneys advanced the European countries during the war.

Mr. DUNBAR. That is going back to that other subject.

Mr. RANKIN. That statement is incorrect, because in the debate on those debt settlements, the I O U's were read in which those countries promised to pay the amount loaned.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. This entire debate on the matter of debt settlement is out of order under the rule, is it not?

The CHAIRMAN. The rule provides that debate shall be confined to the bill.

Mr. DUNBAR. Let us all keep off the matter of the debt.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is not well taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman did not make a point of order. The gentleman from Indiana will proceed in order.

Mr. RANKIN. I just want to say, if the gentleman will yield there, that this discussion has been entirely in order.

Mr. DUNBAR. I think so.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Indiana was entirely within his rights in discussing it.

Mr. DUNBAR. I think so. I have heard many subjects discussed on this floor in which the speaker deviated more from his subject than I have deviated from mine to-day, and I think those who addressed the House deviated farther than I. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I think the gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. CONNERY. The gentleman from Indiana will remember that the gentleman from Texas said that this bill is going along and will be passed and then will go over to the Senate and proceed in proper order to the President. Is not this the gentleman's experience with veterans' legislation—that if we should pass the amendment I suggest, bringing it up to 1930, and the gentleman said he would support that, which would cost approximately \$300,000,000, yet when that gets to another body, that body will immediately slash it, and then when it is put up to the President it will not be \$300,000,000, but that in the last days of the session it will be rushed through and not be anywhere near \$100,000,000?

Mr. DUNBAR. I say to the gentleman that no conclusive evidence, founded on any calculation with facts as a basis, has been submitted to this body, although the statement has been made that if the Rankin amendment is adopted it will increase the amount to be paid by \$400,000,000 a year, and I say to the gentlemen who have charge of the bill that while you have received this information in the last few days, at the same time it should have been given to the committee two or three months ago so that the calculations which went to make up this amount could have been analyzed and investigated, and determined upon, with those who had another viewpoint, and then it would have been a matter for discussion.

Mr. RANKIN. The Director of the Veterans' Bureau has written within the last few days, and I have inserted his statement in the RECORD, in which he says that if the Rankin bill is imposed on the Johnson bill up to 1930 it would only increase the amount by \$31,000,000 a year.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. That would be so with respect to the claims that have been filed, but all of the claims have not yet been filed.

Mr. DUNBAR. Various suppositions may have been brought into the cases.

Mr. RANKIN. If you were to add \$400,000,000 you would probably have five times as many cases as you have had heretofore?

Mr. DUNBAR. What if you did pay \$400,000,000, if we could thereby relieve the suffering of the World War Veterans?

Mr. RANKIN. I think his statement is simply misleading the House. If the Rankin bill is imposed on the Johnson bill, extending the presumptive period to 1930, the entire bill will cost only \$108,000,000. That is according to the figures submitted by the Veterans' Bureau.

Mr. DUNBAR. Now gentlemen talk about the large amount of money drawn out of the Treasury of the United States in behalf of our veterans. We paid last year \$221,000,000 of actual money to the veterans themselves. But that is not much more than half the money that the Government of the United States received for the tax imposed on cigarettes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. DUNBAR. Three hundred and forty-one million dollars was paid into the Treasury of the United States last year from the tax imposed on cigarettes, and that did not include the revenue on the paper used in the making of the cigarettes. That tax, I say, was paid on cigarettes, and yet we paid only \$221,000,000 for the relief of the World War veterans, using the words put in by the committee.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUNBAR. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. When considering the tax revenues from cigarettes you must realize that Dr. Clarence True Wilson, the ardent prohibitionist, has launched an attack upon the use of cigarettes. If he is as successful on cigarettes as he has been on prohibition, we will not have that cigarette-tax revenue in the future.

Mr. DUNBAR. Does not the gentleman think that if a man smoked a pipe or a cigar he would be better off than if he smoked cigarettes?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. No. I think he would be much better off if he drank light wine or beer. [Laughter.]

Mr. RANKIN. There is no more danger of prohibiting the use of cigarettes by law than there is of repealing the eighteenth amendment or modifying the Volstead Act, for which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER] has been clamoring.

Mr. DUNBAR. Mr. Chairman, it has been stated that if T. B. was not connected up with service to 1925 it could not be connected up with service from 1925 to 1930. Let me read to you about T. B. from the Encyclopedia Americana. It has been stated by some that if T. B. has not manifested itself by 1925 the predisposing cause was other than war. This is not true. As stated by the Encyclopedia Americana:

Any circumstance which tends to lower the general resistance decreases the resistance to tuberculosis.

Who is there who will proclaim that those who engaged in the World War did not encounter circumstances which tended to lower vital resistance to T. B.?

The Encyclopedia Americana, on the subject of tuberculosis, written by James Walsh, A. M., M. D., and who was considered one of the best authorities on this subject by the editors, states that chronic tuberculosis of the lungs at the onset is usually insidious and the disease frequently progresses for from 5 to 20 years before the patient recognizes it, unless he is examined annually by a physician, aided by all the modern scientific apparatus, the expense of which 90 per cent of the veterans of the World War can not afford.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUNBAR. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I am very much pleased because the committee has brought this matter out for discussion on the floor of the House, and I think it is very fine to have it done in this way. I am sure it is going to be beneficial. I am very much interested in what the gentleman from Indiana is saying, and I think he is making a wonderfully interesting talk upon this subject, and I think he will not object to this statement going into the RECORD.

Mr. DUNBAR. I thank the gentleman for his friendly words.

Tuberculosis is a very insidious disease. It takes often from 5 to 25 years before it manifests itself. A man may not know he has it during that time unless he is examined by a competent physician, aided by scientific apparatus. Our soldiers can not afford these examinations. There are many soldiers who went to the front to fight in the war which made more than 25,000 American millionaires—and some of them are worth hundreds of millions—and should not these soldiers be given the benefit of the doubt? In fact, the probability is that chronic tuberculosis in most of the cases which appeared between 1925 and 1930 was caused by their serving in the World War and these soldiers are deprived of compensation from the Government.

I want to say, gentlemen, it is not fair and it is not just. I will vote for the Rankin amendment to extend the presumptive period of tuberculosis and mental diseases which occur up to 1930 being permitted to be connected with service origin.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. DUNBAR. Yes.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman vote for an amendment which I will offer to bring it up to 1930, including all diseases?

Mr. DUNBAR. I will.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman vote for an amendment to bring it up to 1940 or 1945?

Mr. DUNBAR. No; but I believe that by 1933 we can devise some intelligent plan by which we can take care of all the veterans of our wars.

A man can take an ounce of whisky and not get drunk, but if he takes a pint he will probably become intoxicated. So, you can not compare a man who could drink a pint with a man who would drink an ounce.

It is said that we are not able to pay the soldiers' bonus. The Federal debt in the United States was decreased in the last 11 years more than \$9,000,000,000. Last year we reduced the Federal debt \$734,000,000. The gentleman may say that our surplus was not that much. Nevertheless, notwithstanding the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, which shows that our surplus was only two or three hundred million dollars, we reduced our debt last year \$734,000,000. You have to take with a great deal of allowance all the public utterances respecting our settlements of debt and our own finances. It has been stated that Mr. RANKIN's bill would increase the debt \$400,000,000. This is an unverified estimate coming from no one knows where and is similar to other high-brow estimators. General Lord, who was the head of the Budget system, on April 23, 1923, made a speech in Indiana which was carried in the Associated Press. He predicted in that speech that our deficit for the year 1923, which would end in three months, would be \$280,000,000. Two weeks later in Salt Lake City or somewhere farther west, he predicted our deficit would be \$280,000,000 and \$190,000,000, and it turned out that two or three months after he made that prediction the annual statement of the Secretary of the Treasury was issued and showed that we have reduced our debt \$700,000,000 that year. The ignorance that would cause a man connected with our Government to make such a statement and have it proclaimed all over the land, I can not understand, and therefore I do not accept statements which are made, giving figures, until I have an opportunity to investigate them.

Our debt reduction this year will be more than it was last year. Who says that we can not pay our soldiers \$400,000,000? I know it would not be that much more, but, that objection is eliminated, because the decrease in our debt this year will be something like \$800,000,000.

It may be claimed that our revenue is going to gradually grow less. I do not believe it. Our expenditures may increase, of course, but the time will come when Federal rebates to internal-revenue taxpayers will become less. If reports are true, we are going to save \$1,000,000,000 in six years as a result of the London conference. That will take care of some of our increased expenditures and then the cigarette tax is increasing at the rate of \$30,000,000 per year, and our interest charges are being reduced \$25,000,000 annually.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. RANKIN. I yield the gentleman three minutes more.

Mr. DUNBAR. From June 30 last year up until this date the surplus applicable to the reduction of our public debt, as I read it in the detailed statement of the Federal Treasurer's report, was \$536,000,000. In other words, we have reduced our debt \$536,000,000 already this year, and we are \$40,000,000 ahead of one year ago. In other words, our receipts less our expenditures are \$40,000,000 more than our receipts a year ago, over our expenditures.

The cigarette tax is increasing at the rate of \$35,000,000. In 10 years from now the tax on cigarettes will take care of all the money that we have paid to the veterans.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUNBAR. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I hope the gentleman will not take all the Government expense out of cigarettes alone. Let us have something else. I come from a great cigarette country, and I am trying to get some of the tax removed.

Mr. DUNBAR. I agree with the gentleman, that the tax on cigarettes is excessive, yet, people all pay it willingly.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I understand that.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUNBAR. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CONNERY. I think the cigarette industry should be able to carry it, judging from the cigarettes that we smoked over in France. The soldiers should get some return from the cigarette industry.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I am for the soldier, but I do not want to put all the tax on cigarettes.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUNBAR. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. The gentleman might make a compromise with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ABERNETHY] and modify the prohibition laws and obtain a tax revenue on light wines and beer and relieve cigarettes from a part of the tax which they are now bearing. [Laughter.]

Mr. DUNBAR. I agree with Mr. CONNERY that we are indebted to the American soldier, who started the cigarette habit

over in France, the tax from which collected by our Government exceeds the "benefits" paid World War veterans and their dependents more than \$120,000,000 annually. The ladies are also indebted to the soldier for the former unknown bliss and raptures afforded by smoking tobacco. We are going to continue to decrease our debt between \$700,000,000 and \$800,000,000 a year. I agree with the gentleman that England made an honorable settlement of her debt. I do not expect we will ever get much from any other government, but there will be a little come in the next two years to take care of the "benefits" we additionally grant World War veterans.

Gentlemen, I am glad for the consideration that has been given to the soldier. He has not received sufficient consideration. I am glad the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] brought in this bill, because, as I said before, it is only a step forward. I am glad the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] started the agitation. He did start the agitation, and a great deal of credit should be given to him. I am glad that the efforts of these gentlemen—two wonderful soldier friends—will help bring justice to the soldiers. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MAPES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10381) to amend the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended, and had come to no resolution thereon.

THE LONDON NAVAL CONFERENCE

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting therein the radio speech of Senator ROBINSON, broadcasted from London, on the results of the London conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing the London radio address of Senator ROBINSON. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RADIO ADDRESS OF SENATOR ROBINSON

Following is the text of Senator ROBINSON's address as heard here:

The conference having concluded its work except for the formal ceremony of signing the treaty, it seems appropriate to summarize the results. No effort is in mind to speak from a technical viewpoint. The desire is to present in condensed form the principal features of the arrangement entered into with regard to the programs of the three chief naval powers.

The prime objectives of our delegation have been:

1. To cooperate with other delegations in terminating naval competition by limiting all classes of warships.
2. To secure equality of naval strength for the United States with Great Britain.
3. To arrange a satisfactory relation between our Navy and that of the Japanese.
4. To bring about reductions in tonnage wherever practicable.

Let us consider the degree to which these objectives have been attained.

It is clear that as a 5-power enterprise there is not complete success. The importance of this is not to be minimized. Unquestionably it would have been more satisfactory to have a treaty defining the programs of France and Italy as well as those of Great Britain, the United States, and Japan. The Italians insisted on parity with the navy of the strongest continental power, even though there is little likelihood that Italy would actually build up to French tonnage during the period of the treaty. The French refused this demand. France is carrying forward a naval construction program materially increasing her tonnage in cruisers, submarine boats, and destroyers. She was not disposed to reduce these tonnages without new guaranties of security.

CONTINGENT CLAUSE USED

The various methods of creating new guaranties of security were amply discussed in the press while the negotiations were in progress. No delegation asked the United States to participate in any security pact. The American delegation made it plain that the United States would not join any consultative pact which could by implication be regarded as giving security. The French said that a mere consultative pact would not take 1 ton off their navy. The French and British tried to restate their security obligations as a basis for a reduction in French tonnage. This effort had to be linked with a settlement between France and Italy. It was the realization that this double settlement would have to be postponed that led to the conclusion of the conference

on the present basis, and the insertion of a contingent clause to which further reference will be made.

We took the position that fair limitation of armament is of itself a wholesome and effective measure of security, tending to promote international good will and pacific measures for adjustment of disputes where treaty relations are threatened or disturbed. Consultation is a logical and probably inevitable process; but agreements for consultation, unless carefully safeguarded and entered into in advance, in the opinion of many tend to the formation of alliances and to the assumption of responsibility for decisions which might result in involvements which our people desire to avoid.

Efforts to negotiate a 5-power arrangement were continued—perhaps they were unduly prolonged—finally resulting in a postponement of conclusions between the European powers and participation by France and Italy in the provisions of the treaty except those relating to the limitation of tonnages. The provisions in which all five powers join, while less comprehensive than those entered into by the United States, Great Britain, and Japan, include the battleship holiday and the restriction on the use of submarines against merchant ships in time of war, which in themselves are achievements of magnitude and value.

SUBMARINE WARFARE LIMITED

With respect to the above-mentioned restriction on the use of submarines the five powers accept as rules of international law:

1. That submarines in action with regard to merchant ships must conform to the rules applicable to surface vessels.

2. More definitely stated, save in case of persistent refusal to stop when duly summoned or of active resistance to visit or search, neither surface craft nor submarine may sink or render incapable of navigation a merchant ship without first safeguarding the passengers, crew, and ship's papers. It is further declared that placing passengers, crew, and ship's papers in the ship's boats is not a compliance with this rule unless safety is assured by sea and weather conditions, proximity to land, or the presence of another vessel to take them on board.

The acceptance of these rules as international law may not prevent all abuses of the character denounced. Undoubtedly in time of war belligerents will be tempted to violate them. However great such temptations may prove, parties to future conflicts will be slow to challenge the resentment of mankind by ruthless destruction of merchant vessels, for such a course would invite results disastrous to the offender.

The limitations agreed to by the three powers are accompanied by a contingent clause which provides that if any one of the three feels its national security jeopardized by new naval construction of any power whose auxiliary fleet has not been limited, it may notify the others what increase it requires. The others may then make proportionate increases. This is in no sense a sanction; neither does it provide for consultation.

Of course, it may be said in criticism that this clause permits a disturbance of the limitation agreed to on the sole responsibility of either the United States, Great Britain or Japan, and that if any one of the three adjudges it to be necessary to build in excess of the treaty program this will increase the building of the other two. But even if this should happen the relation of the fleets and the principles of limitation would still be maintained.

It should also be remembered that the limitation of armaments must proceed only through the voluntary action of nations and that no power can arbitrarily impose on another restrictions of the means of defense without assuming moral responsibility for its safety. It is of first importance that the limitation of armaments shall be regarded as increasing rather than diminishing the safety of peoples, and if emergencies, regarded as remote but nevertheless as possible, arise, threatening immediate danger, the peoples should be free to respond to the requirements of their situation.

Otherwise the fate of nations must forever be bound up with the maintenance of large armaments and the imminence of war. This clause is based upon the good faith of the three nations, and it is inconceivable that it will be used except upon necessity. It leaves the responsibility of determining the requirements for national security where it belongs, namely, on the respective nations.

A clause providing for consultation or mutual agreement might imply some measure of obligation of all who enter into it. Failure to bind ourselves to consult or mediate in no way impairs the right of the United States to consult and give advice and even tender good offices should the occasion justify, but we should be left free to act as the friend of both parties to a dispute or at least as impartial in all controversies which do not involve American rights or interest.

This treaty vitally affects the relations between the Navies of Great Britain, Japan, and the United States in every category of war vessels.

The treaty contemplates two important changes from the Washington treaty adjustment regarding capital ships. Under the plan now in force, prior to December 31, 1936, the United States would lay down 10, Great Britain 10, and Japan 6 new capital ships. Under the proposed London treaty no new ships of this class will be laid down.

In addition to the holiday, the three powers will commence to scrap in this class prior to December 31, 1931:

Great Britain, 5; United States, 3; Japan, 1.

SEES HUGE EXPENSE DEFERRED

Thus substantial parity between the United States and Great Britain will result following the close of 1931. Postponement of construction of the 10 ships referred to will probably contribute to a final permanent reduction in this category. It will certainly defer the expenditure by the United States of at least \$300,000,000 during the life of the treaty. The early scrapping agreed upon likewise will result in avoiding expenditure which otherwise would be required for repair, maintenance, and operation.

Our experts are of the unanimous opinion that these amendments to the battleship program will bring about actual parity between the United States and Great Britain in capital ships.

In the large cruiser class, carrying 8-inch guns, the United States will have 18 ships with a tonnage of 180,000, Great Britain will have 15 ships aggregating in tonnage 148,000, and Japan 12 ships totaling 108,400 tons. The United States desired a considerable number of vessels having a long cruising radius, while Great Britain found a comparatively large number of the small type better adapted to her purpose.

The superiority afforded the United States in these large cruisers constituted recognition to some extent of the difference in type of cruisers required for her purposes as compared with the British needs. Prolonged investigation of the subject led to the conclusion that no scientific basis exists for measuring the difference in value between large 8-inch gun cruisers and vessels carrying 6-inch guns. To offset the American advantage of 33,200 tons in 8-inch gun cruisers Great Britain has the right to employ in 6-inch gun cruisers 48,700 tons more than the United States, making a net difference in the cruiser tonnage of the two powers of 15,500 in favor of Great Britain in cruisers of all classes.

It is not possible to say that this difference corresponds with mathematical accuracy to the superior value of the large cruisers which the United States has the right to possess over those allowed Great Britain.

Within certain ranges 6-inch guns are more effective than 8-inch guns. At great distances, however, the advantage clearly is in the ship carrying guns with the longest range. On the other hand, the smaller guns can be fired more rapidly and perhaps more accurately than the heavy 8-inch weapons.

There can be no important advantage to either of the two powers because of this difference in 8-inch cruiser tonnage.

Moreover, it may be emphasized that the United States has the option to build exactly Great Britain's program and thereby produce a ton-for-ton parity between the two countries.

DESTROYERS CUT SHARPLY

In the destroyer category very material reductions are made. The United States now has a tonnage considerably in excess of 200,000, but many of the ships are old, and nothing like the present number is required. Great Britain and the United States will each have 150,000 tons in destroyers. The present Japanese fleet of 6-inch gun cruisers is 98,415 tons. The treaty gives Japan 100,450 tons. The present Japanese destroyer fleet is 129,375 tons. In these two categories Japan will have 70 per cent of our fleet and 17,000 tons less than the present.

Finally, each of the three powers may have 52,700 tons in submarines. In the conference the United States and Great Britain sought to abolish warships of this class, but other powers were unwilling to do so and limitation was resorted to at a relatively low tonnage.

The United States at the opening of the conference was inferior in submarine tonnage to both Great Britain and Japan. Our inferiority in this class, as in the cruiser category, is attributable to our failure to build following the Washington conference. From the ratification of the Washington treaty until now the United States has neglected building not only in those classes in which a war surplus remained, but also in cruisers in which our Navy was deficient.

COMPARES TONNAGES LAID DOWN

The total tonnage in all classes of auxiliary craft laid down by the United States during the years 1922 to 1930, inclusive, was 138,120. During that time Great Britain laid down 203,725 tons, Japan 242,771 tons, France 249,454 tons, and Italy 163,943 tons. It is apparent that in those years the United States had a much smaller building program than any of the other four powers.

Our war tonnage is now becoming obsolescent and we are faced with the necessity of rebuilding much of the Navy. The treaty enables us to proceed with the task in an orderly manner and at a lower total tonnage than we have had in the past, in spite of the fact that we have built less than any other country represented at the conference.

This is the story of the treaty in figures as comprehensively related as found practicable within the proper limits of this address. There are other bases than that here employed for comparison, but it is believed that the one chosen for present purposes gives the clearest showing possible of what has been accomplished and some reasons for the programs incorporated in the treaty.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting the short radio address, delivered by Secretary Stimson to the Associated Press.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
There was no objection.
The address was as follows:

RADIO ADDRESS OF SECRETARY STIMSON

Mr. Noyes and gentlemen of the Associated Press, when I had the pleasure of meeting the directors of the Associated Press last January at the dinner given by Mr. Ochs I warned you that the London conference would be a prosaic performance. I prophesied that what it lacked in drama it would make up in length. I think you will agree with me that my prophecy has been fulfilled.

Yet because it has involved tedious and necessarily private negotiation it would be a great error to jump to the conclusion that it does not contain dramatic promise for the future. As a matter of fact, the past 14 weeks have given me more confidence in my belief that the peaceful methods of diplomacy can eventually take the place of war than anything I have witnessed since the last war drew to a close. This conference is based on the fact that limitation of arms gives us an affirmative plan for promoting good relations. Merely negative opposition to war is not sufficient. Progress in civilization comes only from the affirmative cultivation of habits of good will.

Nearly two years ago the nations of the world met together at Paris and signed a document containing a good resolution of epoch-making importance. That was the so-called Kellogg-Briand pact, in which the nations renounced war as an instrument of national policy and agreed in future to solve their controversies only by pacific means. That instrument proposed a new era. It laid down a new international policy and it had behind it a general and overwhelming popular support. But such a proposal can not be made and then left alone to hatch. New eras do not come out of old conditions merely by a new edict or a good resolution.

In order to reach a condition when no nation will resort to war as an instrument of national policy there must be established a larger measure of confidence than now exists in the ability of the different nations of the world to maintain their pacific intentions under all the temptations and circumstances which are sure to confront them. History shows us only too clearly what will happen if we leave the old conditions unchanged. Affirmative constructive steps must be taken to carry out our good resolution and to begin the evolution in mutual confidence and good will, upon which the success of our resolution depends. Otherwise the failure of our good resolutions may produce a condition worse than if they had never been made.

Last spring President Hoover wisely decided that one of the most important of such constructive steps was a move toward naval limitation.

He realized that if the nations mean the Kellogg pact literally they must not allow conditions to arise that will jeopardize their promise. The first method to that end is an agreement on limitation of armaments. That is a clear and positive test of a national intention to maintain pacific relations under all circumstances. Such an agreement by its very nature precludes the idea of war as an instrument of national policy. For no nation is likely to agree that its neighbors shall have a navy large enough for such a purpose.

ARMS LIMITATION A BAROMETER

One of the surest tests, therefore, of the effectiveness of the Kellogg-Briand pact is the progress which is being made in the limitation of armament. Limitation of armament is a barometer or gauge of the development of confidence between nations which will enable them to deal with each other wholly upon an amicable basis. It is for this reason that my experience in the naval conference has given me so much encouragement. This encouragement is not based solely on an appraisal of just how much has been accomplished in the particular treaty which we are signing but also upon the demonstration which this treaty affords that the process of limitation can be carried further in the future.

The work of the London conference has really comprised two quite separate naval problems—the problem of the relations between the navies of the United States, Great Britain, and Japan on the one hand, and the problem of the relations between the navies of Great Britain, France, and Italy on the other.

These are quite distinct problems. The first of these has been solved. This is a great achievement in itself and fruitful of great benefit to the general conditions of the world for the future. But it is a far simpler problem than the other because the naval relation of three countries, separated by such great oceans and wide distances as separate Great Britain, the United States, and Japan are necessarily less complex than the naval relations of the great powers of Europe. The latter are complicated by many conditions from which the former are entirely free. Furthermore America's isolated and advantageous position and the national security which this position affords imposes upon us the duty to lead in the limitation of armaments and to refrain from criticizing others less fortunately placed.

In the second of these problems—the problem of the relations of the navies of Great Britain, France, and Italy—valuable discussions have been had and the underlying questions upon which a final solution must rest have been explored and clarified. In much of the discussion members of the American delegation have been privileged to sit as friendly observers, watching the development and clarification of these under-

lying questions. The discussion has not merely involved a negotiation about the size of navies or the types of ships. It has been a study and debate concerning the political questions which govern the relations of these three nations of Europe to each other.

ISSUES HAVE BEEN CLARIFIED

Into these political questions it has not been America's business to enter. But sitting on the side lines it has been quite evident that the result of the conference has been to clarify issues and make their solution in the future more possible. In this way a long step forward has been made toward ultimate limitation by those nations which have not yet agreed on a complete limitation of their navies.

This came not only by clarifying the results of their discussion but by the patience and good temper in which those discussions were carried on. This has been a good augury for the prospects of their final success. They are separating now full of determination to grapple with these problems as they now stand revealed and to finally solve them.

In summary, the message which I should like to make clear to you all to-day is that the success of the London naval conference is necessarily related to the success of the Kellogg pact. The good resolutions of that pact can not stand alone. They must be followed by national effort, prompt, constant, unremitting effort, to make them good, and no line of effort offers a better earnest of its success than the line of naval disarmament. In selecting that line, President Hoover laid his finger upon the best method of insuring that our solemn promise of two years ago should be fulfilled.

There are but two possible roads to travel. One is the road of competitive armament and this, whether accompanied or unaccompanied by good intentions, will lead to war. The other is the way of limitation with its constant effort to forestall war by creating such confidence and friendliness between nations as will prevent the seeds of war from growing.

We have now before us not only a definite objective but a concrete method of going at it. There is something to work on, to get our teeth into. The hard work and constant vigilance which will translate good intentions into practical realities can be accomplished and are being accomplished by naval limitation. This, to me, is the significance and encouragement of the conference we have just been through.

GREAT SMOKY MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing the proceedings before the Secretary of the Interior, including the addresses of the Governors of the two States of North Carolina and Tennessee, upon the acquisition by the Government of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission given me, I desire to place in the permanent records of the Congress the most interesting ceremonies which were held in the office of the Secretary of the Interior on Thursday, February 6, 1930, when the Governors of the States of North Carolina and Tennessee presented to the Government 158,799.21 acres of land in the area of the proposed Great Smoky Mountains National Park, N. C. and Tenn.

It was my good fortune to have been in charge of the legislation from the Public Lands Committee of the House when the bill was passed establishing this great park. I have had a keen interest in the rapid development made in its establishment. It will, when completed, be a great national playground and spot of scenic wonder and beauty for the pleasure and profit of those who now live and for unborn generations.

The late Director Mather of the National Park Service, in his annual report of 1923, recommended that a thorough study of the Southern Appalachian Mountain Range, extending from Virginia to southern Georgia, be made with a view to selecting the most typically scenic area as a site for a national park which would measure up to the standard, dignity, and prestige of the existing members of the national park system.

Secretary Hubert Work approved of the suggestion, and on February 16, 1924, invited four public-spirited persons to undertake this investigation. He offered Hon. HENRY W. TEMPLE, Representative from Pennsylvania, the chairmanship of the proposed committee. Doctor TEMPLE's long service in Congress and his enthusiastic interest in national parks made his selection appropriate.

The Secretary invited Major Welch, general manager of the Palisades State Park, New York and New Jersey, to become a member, as he was a recognized expert in park matters and had been associated for years in development of State and National parks.

The Secretary asked the Council on National Parks, Forest, and Wild Life to cooperate with him by naming two of its members to serve on the committee. Mr. Harlan P. Kelsey, a director of the Council on National Parks, Forest, and Wild Life, was nominated as one of the members and Mr. William C.

Gregg, the director of the National Arts Club of New York, was nominated as the other member.

Mr. Kelsey, in addition to being a director of the Council on National Parks, Forest, and Wild Life, was president of the American Association of Nurserymen and ex-president of the Appalachian Mountain Club, as well as holding various offices in associations which were interested in National and State parks.

Mr. Gregg had been for years an enthusiastic national park devotee, and had on numerous occasions cooperated with the National Park Service by devoting his time and personal fortune in assisting in the development of national parks.

Col. Glenn S. Smith, who had served the Department of the Interior for more than 35 years as a topographic engineer in the Geological Survey, was designated by the Secretary to represent him on the committee.

The first year of the existence of this committee appointed by Secretary Work was spent in investigating areas in the southern Appalachian Mountains. As the committee was not authorized by Congress, and no funds were therefore made available for the expenses of these investigations, it was necessary for the individual members to pay from their personal funds the expenses in connection with these investigations. However, public-spirited citizens, including one of the members of the committee, donated sufficient funds for carrying on the work for the first year.

Congress, recognizing the important work the committee was doing, authorized the Secretary to appoint the members of the committee as members of a commission and appropriated funds for their expenses, but no salaries were authorized.

For six years the four members of this commission have devoted their time to the securing of areas for national parks in the East at a great sacrifice on their part as they were all men who had business connections which required their attention, and to make the investigations required it was necessary that these men spend considerable time away from their legitimate businesses to carry out the wishes of the Secretary. One of the commissioners took his duties so seriously and was so interested in the work he not only spent his time in making the investigations but paid all his expenses in connection with such investigations from his personal funds, refusing to accept any money from the Government for his expenses.

Ex-Secretary Hubert Work showed great interest from the very outset in securing areas in the East for national parks.

The speeches made on the occasion of the delivery of the deeds for the lands in the park are as follows:

Associate Director Cammerer introduced Gov. O. Max Gardner, of North Carolina, to Secretary Wilbur, and the governor made the following speech of presentation:

Mr. Secretary, North Carolina joins Tennessee to-day in presenting to the Federal Government under existing laws 158,799.21 acres of that unique area designated as the Great Smoky Mountains National Park. Our joint action makes the first concrete step toward the actual consummation of this project and we confidently believe we shall soon take the next step, when the minimum area, or a total of 427,000 acres will be presented. Then, Mr. Secretary, the Federal Government will be free to proceed under the law with the development of a great park in the Appalachian Mountains for the benefit of the entire Nation.

We are presenting to you "the most massive uplift" in the East, containing 18 peaks towering about 6,000 feet. This particular area, lying in almost equal portions in North Carolina and Tennessee, is unsurpassed for natural beauty and grandeur and contains 1,000,000 acres of virgin forests, some of which were full grown when Columbus discovered America.

The Great Smoky Mountains National Park, when established, will create in the heart of the Appalachian Mountains a permanent sanctuary for animal and bird life and a botanical garden and arboretum which scientists say will be unequalled in the world.

This great undertaking, when accomplished, will preserve the last remnant of the American wilderness of any considerable size east of the Mississippi River, and a great tract of virgin timber which will be allowed to stand in its natural grandeur, safe forever from the usual forces of devastation. In conserving this great forest, we shall preserve at its source the water power of two States and minimize considerably the danger of droughts and floods in the southern section of the Nation.

Moreover, through the development contemplated, this area will become a playground of majestic proportions and a recreational center in the East that will be accessible within a day's ride to one-half of the population of the United States, for it lies half way between the Mississippi and the Atlantic, and between the Great Lakes and the Gulf, not more than 500 miles distant from each of these extremes.

No other national park in America will serve with such convenience such a large population, and we confidently believe that in preserving this area and donating it to the Nation we are thereby making the Great Smoky Mountains National Park a certainty, and that through

this action taken to-day we are not only preserving an area of great scenic beauty but we are providing a medium through which the people of the South and all other sections of the Nation will become better acquainted, and in this way we shall effect a finer unity of all our people.

I take very great pleasure, Mr. Secretary, in presenting the deed to the lands lying in North Carolina, and in doing so I feel it only just to our people to speak in praise of the splendid work of the North Carolina Park Commission and the National Park Commission, of the citizens of our State and particularly of Hon. Mark Squires, who have cooperated enthusiastically and contributed liberally of their private funds—\$265,000—and of the General Assembly of North Carolina for its bond issue of \$2,000,000. I would also like to make public acknowledgment of the splendid work of Congressman HENRY W. TEMPLE, of Pennsylvania, chairman of the Appalachian National Park Commission, who with his associates on that commission were responsible for the selection of this park area. And particularly must I record the deep gratitude of North Carolina to the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial for its very generous gift of \$5,000,000 to match the funds of both States. This donation came to us through the great interest and public spirit of Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., through the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial, who assisted in the creation of this park as a memorial to his mother; and her memory will be preserved throughout the ages as long as the park shall last, and the good that she will continue to do through her son's loving remembrance will be an everlasting benefit to our people.

Governor Gardner then presented to Secretary Wilbur the deeds to those park lands lying in North Carolina and included in the 158,799.21 acres.

Mr. Cammerer next introduced Gov. Henry H. Horton, of Tennessee, who made the following speech of presentation:

Mr. Secretary, ladies, and gentlemen, I have the honor and great pleasure of presenting, through you, to the Government of the United States, for national park purposes as authorized by the Federal act of May 22, 1926, and applicable legislation passed by the legislature of the State of Tennessee, deed to 100,176.63 acres of land in that section of the Great Smoky Mountains so beautifully described just now by the Governor of North Carolina.

It is not necessary, nor perhaps appropriate at this time, for me to endeavor to enlarge on the beauties and grandeur of this area and its preeminent fitness for national park purposes—time forbids my attempting it. Suffice it to say that the Southern Appalachian Park Commission, headed by Congressman H. W. TEMPLE and composed of men nationally known for their knowledge of national parks and the policies controlling their establishment and development, after a survey of the entire southern Appalachian range selected this area, and in glowing terms proclaimed its beauty. The Secretary of the Interior later on, after investigation of the merits of the project by his experts of the National Park Service of the Interior Department, verified their recommendation as sound. From that time on the Great Smoky Mountains National Park project took its place among the greatest projects ever undertaken by any State for the benefit of mankind, and for conservation of beautiful scenic areas for the enjoyment of this and future generations.

I believe it fitting that I may here express the gratitude and appreciation of the people of Tennessee to Doctor TEMPLE and his associates on the Appalachian National Park Commission, and to your department, and to you, Mr. Secretary, and your immediate predecessor, Secretary Work, for the generous interest manifested in behalf of the park project. Particularly, do I want to emphasize, also, the deep gratitude and heartfelt appreciation of the people of Tennessee for the valuable substantial support given by the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial in matching funds made available locally in the States of North Carolina and Tennessee, so that the park might become a reality, and to Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., whose personal interest and foresight and public-spiritedness have promised the actual realization of this great plan. I wish also at this time to take the opportunity to acknowledge the State's gratitude to Arno B. Cammerer, Associate Director of the National Park Service, who, as your representative, has been unfailing in his cooperation, official and personal, in the enterprise, and in his assistance in solving many unforeseen problems that constantly arise in a new project of this magnitude with few precedents to turn to for guidance.

And to Col. David C. Chapman, an original park advocate and a citizen of Tennessee who unstintingly, without thought of self or his private affairs, has for years given his time, both personally and as chairman of the Tennessee Great Smoky Mountains Park Commission, toward the furtherance of this project, too much praise can not be given by a grateful State. To the members of the Tennessee Great Smoky Mountains Park Commission and other agencies and individuals who have done so much to help the cause and made possible the establishment of the park I desire also to record the thanks of the State of Tennessee.

I am confident all these, and the members of the legislature of my State and of the Congress of the United States, who have supported and cooperated so faithfully, untiringly, and earnestly in the establishment of this park, will join in my satisfaction and pleasure in being

able to participate in this momentous, historic occasion, which marks definitely the beginning of the establishment of one of the most magnificent national parks of the world.

Let me add that Tennessee is interested in bringing this accomplishment to a successful close as speedily as possible. We now have contracted for 40,000 acres more than was delivered to you to-day, and suits are pending in court for condemnation proceedings to 37,000 acres more.

We are running a race with North Carolina as to which can first deliver the entire amount necessary for the park to the Government of the United States.

Governor Horton then presented to Secretary Wilbur the deeds to those park lands lying within Tennessee and included in the 158,799.21 acres.

Secretary Wilbur, having accepted the deeds, made the following talk:

The Governors of North Carolina and Tennessee, ladies, and gentlemen: This is a particularly happy occasion for me. I have written down a few things to say because this is a historical occasion, but before reading them I want to express my deep personal gratitude to all of you men who have been working so hard to bring about the consummation of this very significant project. You have builded better than you know. We were just about on the verge of losing for the eastern part of our continent all of our great natural glories. Your preservation of a portion of them, and the efforts now being made for the Shenandoah National Park, are the most encouraging thing that I know of in this great field of conservation. In fact, this is the largest real-estate operation with which I have ever been associated. You can go as far as you like in your contest between the two States, and if it is an even race you will get an even heartier welcome than to-day.

You have tendered to me, under the provisions of the act of Congress approved May 22, 1926, providing for the establishment, among other things, of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park in the States of North Carolina and Tennessee, title to some 158,799.21 acres, or nearly 240 square miles of unequaled mountain and valley land in the heart of the Great Smokies, which I hereby accept with the profound thanks of the American people, but, of course, necessarily subject to review of title rendered by the legal officers of the department.

Several years ago when a responsible commission under this department, headed by Congressman TEMPLE, of Pennsylvania, and under authority of the Congress, investigated the Southern Appalachian Mountain Range with the object of ascertaining whether there still remained an area within that range measuring up to national-park standards, they rendered an enthusiastic report on the merits of two possible park projects, one that of the proposed Great Smoky Mountains National Park and the other of the proposed Shenandoah National Park. To-day marks the first step in the final accomplishment of the first.

The committee's requirements for their guidance in such search were:

1. Mountain scenery with inspiring perspectives and delightful details.
2. Areas sufficiently extensive and adaptable so that annually millions of visitors might enjoy the benefit of outdoor life and communion with nature without the confusion of overcrowding.
3. A substantial part to contain forests, shrubs and flowers, and mountains and streams, with picturesque cascades and waterfalls overhung with foliage, all untouched by the hand of man.
4. Abundant springs and streams available for camps and fishing.
5. Opportunities for protecting and developing the wild life of the area, and the whole to be a natural museum, preserving outstanding features of the Southern Appalachians as they appeared in the early pioneer days.

6. Accessibility by rail and road.

In what is now the Great Smoky Mountains National Park area was found an area measuring up to the requirements of a national park area, because of the "height of mountains, depth of valleys, ruggedness of the area, and the unexampled variety of trees, shrubs, and plants. The region includes Mount Guyot, Mount Le Conte, Clingmans Dome, and Gregory Bald, and may be extended in several directions to include other splendid mountain regions adjacent thereto."

The department representative directed to review their findings confirmed those facts, and that the area measured up to national park standards in every particular. You therefore are tendering title to a portion of that national park for administrative and protective purposes as authorized by the Federal law, which will soon be followed by the tender of title to the remainder of not less than 277,000 acres to complete the park. At that time the National Park Service of the Interior Department may assume charge of its development as a complete national park under the jurisdiction of the Interior Department.

The States of North Carolina and Tennessee, through their citizens and legislatures, subscribed nearly \$5,000,000 toward this project, which was later matched up to \$5,000,000 by a pledge of the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial in memory of Laura Spelman Rockefeller, completing a fund which it is estimated, based upon the best then available information, is sufficient, I am informed, to complete the purchase of the minimum park project. I particularly want to express my appreciation of the great public spirit shown by the

Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial and Mr. John D. Rockefeller, jr., in making this great park project a possibility through their magnificent contribution as a memorial to Laura Spelman Rockefeller. I have not yet had the good fortune to make a personal inspection of this area; but from all I know from those who have been so fortunate I will find one of the most inspiring, romantic, and scenic areas in the Americas when I do visit it, which I hope to do very soon.

In the acquisition of this land for the park for national-park purposes there were no precedents to guide the several States and their representatives. All western national parks were carved from the public domain of the United States, and the acquisition of the land did not cost the Government anything, nor were serious problems of acquisition involved. A different problem had to be met in the Smokies, since the Government could not well, along established policies, spend Federal funds in the acquisition of such land, and the method followed by the two States of securing funds privately had to be followed.

The gathering of the necessary funds, the passing of the special legislation, both Federal and State, necessary to accomplish the object, the acquisition of the many individual parcels of land by purchase or condemnation, all presented titanic problems which, through the earnestness and hard work of the several State park commissions, supported by their respective governors and State legislatures, have been overcome as they arose. Especially do I want to compliment through you the splendid efforts of your respective park commissions headed by the Hon. Mark Squires, of North Carolina, and Col. David C. Chapman, of Tennessee, whose work I consider outstanding in such national effort. The States of North Carolina and Tennessee, their governors, their legislatures, and their park commissions are accomplishing what at one time was considered the impossible, and posterity will forever record the remarkable work that has been done by them and those others who are making the Great Smoky Mountains National Park a fact. This park will when finally completed, I am confident, play its important part in the future progress of the great Commonwealths of North Carolina and Tennessee.

The peoples of the United States will ever appreciate the great work you have done in saving this area, for in the long run we are the sons and daughters of nature, and nature is at her choicest in the Great Smoky Mountains National Park.

Director Horace M. Albright, of the National Park Service, introduced the following members of the North Carolina Park Commission as follows:

Hon. Mark Squires, chairman; Hon. Eugene C. Brooks, secretary; Hon. Verne Rhoades, executive secretary; Hon. D. M. Buck; Hon. John G. Dawson; Hon. Plato D. Ebbs; Hon. R. T. Fountain; Hon. J. A. Hardison; Hon. Stuart W. Cramer; Hon. J. Elmer Long; Hon. Harry L. Nettles; Hon. E. S. Parker, jr.

The Tennessee Park Commission were introduced by Mr. Albright as follows:

Col. David C. Chapman, chairman; Hon. Frederick A. Ault, secretary-treasurer; Hon. J. M. Clark; Hon. E. E. Conner; Hon. Henry E. Colton; Hon. L. B. Allen; Hon. A. E. Markham; Hon. B. A. Morton.

Mr. Albright also presented Representative H. W. TEMPLE, chairman of the Appalachian Park Commission; Col. Glenn S. Smith, secretary of the commission; Mr. Kenneth Charley, representative of the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial; and the Members of Congress from North Carolina and Tennessee who were present.

The presentation ceremonies marked a great occasion.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE UNIFICATION OF BUOYAGE AND LIGHTING OF COASTS (S. DOC. NO. 134)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the inclosed report from the Acting Secretary of State, to the end that legislation may be enacted to authorize an appropriation in the sum of \$4,500 for the expenses of participation by the United States in an International Conference on the Unification of Buoyage and Lighting of Coasts, to be held in Lisbon, October 6, 1930.

HERBERT HOOVER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 22, 1930.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. DAVIS on account of death in family.

ADDRESS OF SECRETARY OF WAR HURLEY

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the radio address made to-day by the Sec-

retary of War on the occasion of the unveiling of the memorial to the pioneer woman.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the radio address broadcast from his study by the Hon. Patrick J. Hurley, Secretary of War, upon the occasion of the unveiling of the monument to the Pioneer Woman, at Ponca City, Okla., to-day, April 22, 1930. His address is as follows:

THE PIONEER WOMAN

We are assembled here to-day to dedicate this beautiful monument to the Pioneer Woman of America. This memorial is a rather late tribute to her sterling character. Woman has never been given her just place in history as a pioneer, an educator, a builder, or as a leader. This is probably due to the fact that most of the pages of history are written by men about men. The history of our civilization is a chronicle of cruelties. Warfare is the chief subject of history and men are the demons as well as the heroes in all wars. Women and children are the chief sufferers of war. The founders of the great religions—the giant minds in philosophy, in arts, and in sciences, have usually been men. The captains of industry and kings of commerce and the builders and leaders of government have been men.

Historians have been so busy with the lives of great sons that they have not stopped to immortalize the mothers who produced them. The characters of men are molded by women. We have reached that period in civilization where we are fair enough to accord to woman the honor of the preeminent part she has taken in shaping the destinies of mankind. As evidence of that fair-mindedness we are assembled here to-day to dedicate a monument to the memory of a woman. The woman has held the objectives gained by the man. She has been the bulwark ever standing between civilization and barbarism.

When we speak of the pioneer woman, we are very naturally inclined to limit her sphere to the last frontier in the United States—the place we know and love so well—our own Southwest. But the pioneer woman has played her part in the conquest of nature through all the ages. She has been with her man and her family in their struggles with the wilderness and the desert places of the world. She came to the Atlantic coast with the first colonists. She has fought by her man's side, borne and protected his children, clear across this continent to its last frontier. The story of her struggles, her sacrifices, her pains, and her sorrows, is lost in the passing of the years. The nameless grave of the pioneer woman is by every stream, on every plain and mountain, from north to south, from east to west, of this great land. The nameless graves of unknown pioneer women are especially numerous here on the sun-kissed plains of the Southwest. It is altogether proper that this beautiful monument to the pioneer woman should be erected here in the storied land of chivalry—the last frontier.

We are unveiling this monument to the pioneer woman on the forty-first anniversary of the opening of a portion of Oklahoma to the white settlers. What is now the State of Oklahoma was then two Territories. The eastern half was Indian Territory and was occupied by the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians—the Choctaw, Chickasaw, Cherokees, Creeks, and Seminoles. The western half was occupied by the so-called wild tribes of Indians and was called Oklahoma Territory. White people lived with the Five Tribes in Indian Territory but were not allowed to settle in Oklahoma Territory. Forty-one years ago to-day the shots fired by the United States cavalymen sounded the call that started thousands of American pioneers and pioneer women on one of the most unusual and interesting races ever run. The prize to the winners in that race was a homestead of rich land, an opportunity to build a home for a family in a wild country.

The hardships to which the men were subjected during the first years of occupancy of Oklahoma were great. Those to which the women were subjected were pitiful. We like to picture our frontier father as a stalwart man, armed with good weapons, marching out into a country where the chances for success were not equal to the dangers that must be encountered. We admire him for his strength and his unflinching courage, but the real fortitude of that expedition was in the heart of the woman who marched with him. I fancy I see her now, her smiling face encircled by a sunbonnet. She was young, brave, and beautiful. It was she who fortified the new home. It was she who went down into the valley of the shadow of death to bring forth the sturdy sons and daughters of the pioneers. It was she who stayed when all others were anxious to leave. It was the pioneer woman, and not the pioneer, who conquered the frontier. In most instances she died before her time. She died often in childbirth; more often probably from the diseases of the frontier, such as malaria, smallpox, and typhoid, without science or medicine to assist her in her battle. The fights of the frontiersman were occasional and fitful. The fight of the pioneer woman was everlasting. But with all this she was the most buoyant, the most cheerful, the most enthusiastic character that our great country has yet produced. Her strong heart sang in the fight with the vicissitudes of an adventurous and uncertain life. The sons of pioneer women every-

where throughout this land of ours stand with uncovered head to-day to do homage to the noblest character of America.

The pioneer woman gave to America its character and soul. The men of the frontier were usually primitive and strong. The very spirit that led them to the frontier would lead them on in the struggle with the unbridled forces of nature. They were as lawless as they were strong. It was the women's influence that led them to establish government and to respect it. It was the restraining influence, the moral guidance of women, the influence of a home, the responsibility of a family that led these rugged men to submit to the orderly processes of law in the settlement of their disputes.

It was the stanchness and uprightness of her character that made community life possible. She saw to it that the actions of her men-folk and children were consistent with the principles of right living. In her own way she had aspirations for mankind at large, but her highest hopes were for the welfare of her own children. She had no use for teachings of despair and distrust. She was a believer in true aristocracy—the aristocracy of mind and character and service. She despised false pride, the presumptions of class, hypocrisy, and snobbishness. Distinction, to her mind, could not be bought or inherited. It could be won only by work, by service to others, by the personal achievement of the individual. Those were the yardsticks by which she measured greatness.

Her appreciation of the eternal worth of character was profound. From this high valuation that she placed on character springs the libel that she was narrow and intolerant in questions of morals and personal honor. If an inability to compromise in matters of conscience and private and public morality can be called narrowness and intolerance, then we must convict her of the fault; but it was a fault that laid the foundations of a high-minded citizenry and a country with a moral purpose.

Nurtured in an atmosphere of uncompromising devotion to honor, her son hesitated not a moment to fight and to kill to avenge the slightest insult to the women of his family. He was quite as hasty in revenging himself upon one who questioned his own integrity.

In molding the character of her children the pioneer woman was exacting and relentless. Intuition and experience told her that character is like a white sheet of paper that once stained can never be restored to its original condition. It is far easier to keep the character pure and clean than it is to cleanse it after it has been defiled. That character, like water, seeks its own level, is generally acknowledged to be true. Men may pay deference and do homage to some human character, but if the individual they adulate is not worthy of their worship, the disillusioned admirers will soon forsake their shattered idol.

Human greatness can only be assayed properly in the crucible of time. Each year that passes the searching test of time develops in bolder relief the beauty, the purity, and the strength of the character of the pioneer woman. In an individual sense her character is "like a candle that sets in a window at night." Her fond love cheers us and guides us to higher, nobler lives. But in a larger sense the composite character of the pioneer woman is the character of our Nation. It is the mighty beacon whose effulgent rays testify to the lofty aspirations and ideals of a hundred and twenty million Americans.

When we seek the sources of the clearness of her mind and the strength of her character, we should remember that she was the daughter of the most vigorous, alert, and aggressive peoples of the Old World. In her veins ran the blood of the fiery and fearless conquistadors; or else she came from another race of conquerors, the stanch and sturdy Anglo-Saxons; or claimed descent from the warm-hearted, liberty-loving Celts, the Irish, the Scotch, and the Welsh. Perhaps her ancestry was French, German, or Scandinavian. We may say that she was largely of Nordic and Celtic ancestry, generally held to be the best blood of Europe, and the pioneer woman of the Southwest was the product of a century and a half of breeding from the higher, stronger, more alert and aggressive individuals of a race of colonists, a breeding process that excluded from propagation the weak, the vicious, the cowardly, those of physical infirmity or imperfect organization. She came from a strain that was more truly selected in point of mental and physical vigor, intellectual inquisitiveness, enterprise, and self-reliance than any other human stock in history.

We can not evaluate her character without an appreciation of her intelligence. Hers was an intelligence that quickly and clearly recognized that the three great pillars of democratic government are religion, education, and the home. She trusted God and was a firm believer in the efficacy of prayer. But experience had taught that in certain matters it is useless to look for the interposition of Divine Providence. She felt that she had been given her faculties, her strength of mind and body, to meet the homely problems of everyday existence. She held it presumptuous for anyone to pray God to stop the weeds from growing in the cabbage patch when one could grasp a hoe and go after the weeds in person. When her family—or her flock—were endangered by a marauder she scorned to run weeping to God. She knew that a stout heart and a pair of fearless eyes behind a straight-shooting rifle could do the job, and she often did it. She did thank God devoutly for all the

blessings He had bestowed on her and her loved ones. She thanked Him most for giving her the strength to be worthy of all that she had been given to keep and to enjoy. Hers was a religion of true nobility—of a noble heart that was glad to do homage to the Creator and scorned all weakness, meanness, and dishonesty.

You may have perceived that I have omitted the harrowing details of the bloody conflict that ensued wherever the Indian and white races met. The woman whose life we have been portraying belonged to an all-conquering civilization that brooked no barrier, acknowledged no defeat in its march to empire. The Indians who attempted to stay the march of this civilization belonged to a vanishing race whose tepees slowly receded toward the setting sun as the waves of white conquest broke over its lands. But the Indian mother gave much to the spiritual civilization of the West, and those who knew her hold her memory in respect and love. This memorial is erected to the woman of a fair-skinned race but as a pioneer that woman was preceded by a red-skinned woman whose virtues have received scant recognition. The fortitude, stoicism, and loyalty of the Indian mother are unsurpassed by any womanhood in history. She knew as deep mother's love as that of her white sister.

There was often a deep bond of sympathy between these sisters of two different civilizations. The Indian mother showed the white mother how to conquer many of the terrors of a primitive land and the unfriendly forces of nature. She taught her how to weave, how to distinguish healing herbs and plants, how to apply many of the homely remedies that often saved a little life when medical assistance was far away. She instructed the white mother in the lore of the forest, the stream, and the mountain. Her courageous example in the presence of disease, danger, and death inspired the white mother to emulate her moral and physical fortitude.

Much has been said about the result of the crossing of the blood of the Indian and the white races. In the Southwest we can truly say that that mixture of blood has produced many of our most prominent leaders in thought and action. Let us mention a few of our leaders who represent both races. Sequoyah, the inventor of the Cherokee alphabet; Hon. Charles Curtis, Vice President of the United States; Senator Robert L. Owen, the author of the Federal reserve banking system; Hon. W. W. Hastings, dean of the Oklahoma delegation in Congress; and our own inimitable Will Rogers.

The pioneer woman is the author of peace between the red and white races. Amalgamation and education did for the Indian what fire and sword failed to do. The pioneer woman was the first to recognize that an educated Indian is a good citizen. The pioneer woman was passionately devoted to education. She knew that when the community creates and maintains a competent school system it has gone far toward solving the problem of the perpetuation of democracy and equality of opportunity for the individual. She wanted her children to receive an education. She also wanted them taught an appreciation of their heritage, a vision of public needs and duties, the inspiration to develop and maintain a free government. She saw that the democratic institutions of this Nation can be maintained only so long as the child adheres to the ideals that motivated the father in setting up this Government. For that reason we must name proper education as one of those spiritual agencies that guarantee the perpetuation of our individual prosperity and privileges.

Though we may disagree as to just what are our national faults and what should be our national conduct, we can all agree on our national aspirations. We aspire to establish social and economic justice and to maintain equality of opportunity. We endeavor to promote education, tolerance, and prosperity. We seek to abolish poverty and crime and to advance the cause of peace and good will. Because they are our aspirations, our Government, since its establishment, has brought more happiness to more human beings, over a greater period of time, than has any other government.

That great training agency, that maker of men, the old frontier, has gone forever. Its place as a molder of character and a maker of manhood has been taken by the new school system, but what the frontier taught our fathers and mothers can well be included in the school curriculum of to-day.

The frontier taught that clear thinking was needed in emergency; that actions should be based on facts, not on fancies. It taught that we should put our faith in work and not in words; that what is right deserves not only our respect but our support.

If our school system teaches these rules of right conduct and basic morality as faithfully and thoroughly as the pioneer mother taught them to her brood, then we need entertain no fears for the State's increasing prosperity and happiness.

In the erection of this monument we pledge a reverence to the woman who has laid the foundation of the character of our community, State, and Nation. This tribute to her memory will keep the fundamental principles of her character constantly before the people of Oklahoma. Every citizen who passes this way and looks upon this memorial will be strengthened in the conviction that this State shall be kept worthy of the woman whom this bronze statue commemorates.

Truths are told in tens of thousands of volumes—from thousands of pulpits and rostrums—but they are soon forgotten. They enter the mind

and are present for a moment, but they are soon displaced. But the perpetual lesson of a great example, united to a great truth, carries the lesson from generation to generation, and makes a permanent impression on every character that comes in contact with it. The example of the pioneer woman will remain the foundation of the character of the people when all our words shall have been forgotten. She has achieved certain immortality in every American home. The American people have enshrined the character of the pioneer woman in the pantheon of their hearts.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 7881. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to erect a monument as a memorial to the deceased Indian chiefs and ex-service men of the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe of Indians.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3135. An act granting the consent of Congress to Helena S. Raskob to construct a dam across Robins Cove, a tributary of Chester River, Queen Annes County, Md.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, April 23, 1930, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Wednesday, April 23, 1930, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

(10 a. m.)

To amend the interstate commerce act, as amended, to require separate valuation of terminal facilities and a reasonable return thereon (H. R. 10418).

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL—SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION AND SURVEY

(10.30 a. m.)

To authorize a preliminary examination of the French Broad River for the purpose of flood control (H. R. 10720).

Authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of the Mokelumne River, Calif., and its tributaries, with a view to the control of floods (H. R. 9779).

To provide for a survey of the Tittabawassee and Chippewa Rivers, Mich., with a view to the prevention and control of floods (H. R. 2936).

To authorize a preliminary examination of the Fox River, Wis., for the purpose of flood control (H. R. 11201).

To provide a preliminary survey of Waccamaw River, N. C. and S. C., with a view to the control of its floods (H. R. 10264).

To authorize and direct a preliminary examination of the Hocking River for the distance it flows through Athens County, Ohio (H. R. 8736).

To authorize and direct a preliminary examination of the Mohican River Ditch from Lake Fork, Ohio, south a distance of 8 miles (H. R. 8290).

Authorizing the Secretary of War to cause a preliminary examination and survey to be made of Pearl River from Jackson, Miss., to Rockport, Miss. (H. R. 7430).

To provide for examination and survey of Licking River, Ky. (H. R. 7608).

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

(10.30 a. m.)

To consider branch, chain, and group banking as provided in House Resolution 141.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

(10 a. m.)

Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States (H. J. Res. 114, H. J. Res. 11, H. J. Res. 38).

Proposing an amendment to the eighteenth amendment of the Constitution (H. J. Res. 99).

Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for a referendum on the eighteenth amendment thereof (H. J. Res. 219).

Proposing an amendment to the eighteenth amendment of the Constitution of the United States (H. J. Res. 246).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

417. Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1931 amounting to \$28,693,540 (H. Doc. No. 358) was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII.

Mr. FOSS: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 8568. A bill to compensate the Post Office Department for the extra work caused by the payment of money orders at offices other than those on which the orders are drawn; with amendment (Rept. No. 1257). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PITTEMBERG: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 9300. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to hire vehicles from village delivery carriers; without amendment (Rept. No. 1258). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HAUGEN: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 11789. A bill to aid in the maintenance of engineering experiment stations in connection with the colleges established in the several States under the provisions of an act approved July 2, 1862, and of the acts supplemental thereto; without amendment (Rept. No. 1259). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BEERS: Committee on Printing. H. R. 11274. A bill to amend section 305, chapter 8, title 28 of the United States code relative to the compilation and printing of the opinions of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals; without amendment (Rept. No. 1260). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 10387. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the city of Denver, Colo., the ship's bell, plaque, war record, name plate, and silver service of the cruiser *Denver* that is now or may be in his custody; with amendment (Rept. No. 1256). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 247. A bill validating certain applications for, and entries of, public lands; with amendment (Rept. No. 1261). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MOUSER: A bill (H. R. 11849) to declare the 11th day of November, celebrated and known as Armistice Day, a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITEHEAD: A bill (H. R. 11850) to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of contractors and subcontractors for the post offices and other buildings and work under the supervision of the Treasury Department, and other purposes," approved August 25, 1919, as amended by act of March 6, 1920; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KIESS: A bill (H. R. 11851) to extend the duties and powers of the Bureau of Efficiency to include the government of the insular and Territorial possessions of the United States; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 11852) amending the statutes of the United States to provide for copyright registration of designs; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 11853) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to prepare and manufacture a medal in commemoration of the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of the expedition of Capt. Meriwether Lewis and Capt. William Clark; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. WILLIAMSON: A bill (H. R. 11854) to amend section 43, title 5, United States Code; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. GRANFIELD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 313) directing the President to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's memorial day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIEDRINGHAUS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 314) declaring the transfer of the St. Charles Bridge over the Missouri River on National Highway No. 40 not a sale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLGOOD: A bill (H. R. 11855) for the relief of Homer B. Aldrege, also known as Homer B. Collins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BEERS: A bill (H. R. 11856) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth G. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11857) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 11858) granting an increase of pension to Robert Henkle; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11859) granting a pension to Catherine B. Kinkead; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 11860) for the relief of Lydia Wakanna; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11861) for the relief of Joseph Redwing; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 11862) for the relief of Ralph S. Alioti; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 11863) for the relief of George B. Pfeiffer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KELLY: A bill (H. R. 11864) granting an increase of pension to Agnes C. Ladley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANLOVE: A bill (H. R. 11865) granting a pension to Addie Mabel Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 11866) granting an increase of pension to Eliza McGrew; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRITCHARD: A bill (H. R. 11867) granting a pension to Beulah H. Baldwin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11868) granting a pension to Chester O. Jarrett; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11869) to reimburse Mrs. Charles Stewart for moneys expended by her in treatment of her husband, Charles L. Stewart, who was fatally wounded while in the performance of duty as deputy United States marshal; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11870) extending the time for the consideration of application for retirement of Walter Hinman under the emergency officers' retirement act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 11871) for the relief of Ida M. Everett; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STALKER: A bill (H. R. 11872) granting a pension to John A. Donahue; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11873) granting an increase of pension to Sarah L. Cook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWANSON: A bill (H. R. 11874) granting a pension to Uriel Sliter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWICK: A bill (H. R. 11875) granting an increase of pension to Ida M. Steiner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

7057. Petition of city and county of Honolulu, Board of Supervisors, Honolulu, Hawaii, petitioning Congress to create a charter for the city and county of Honolulu; to the Committee on the Territories.

7058. By Mr. CROSSER: Petition of Eugene Remy and others, favoring passage of House bill 11; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7059. By Mr. DABROW: Resolution of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, urging reinstatement of the clause in the tariff bill (H. R. 2667) authorizing the Tariff Commission to recommend such adjustment of tariff rates as may be justified by the exigencies of trade subject to approval and promulgation by the President of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7060. Also, resolution of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, protesting against the adoption of the export debenture provision of the tariff bill, H. R. 2667; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7061. Also, resolution of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, in reference to section 402 (b) of the tariff bill, H. R. 2667, ap-

proving American valuation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7062. By Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma: Petition of Gobierno Municipal de Carolina, oficina del Alcalde, in favor of bill for economic rehabilitation of Porto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

7063. Also, petition of St. Charles Free Bridge Committee, Clayton, Mo., declaring the transfer of the St. Charles Bridge over the Missouri River on National Highway No. 40, not a sale; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7064. Also, petition of Izaak Walton League of America, Oklahoma City, Okla., in support of House bill 6981; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

7065. Also, petition of Stanwood Lumber Co., Stanwood, Wash., in opposition to tariff on lumber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7066. Also, petition of Henry Mill & Timber Co., Tacoma, Wash., in opposition to duty on logs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7067. Also, petition of Tidewater Lumber Co., Tacoma, Wash., in opposition to tariff on lumber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7068. Also, petition of United States Beet Sugar Association, Washington, D. C., in support of the tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7069. By Mr. HOWARD: Petition signed by Harry Kleinberg, of Wynot, Nebr., and 61 other persons of Cedar County, Nebr., pleading for the passage of House bill 2562, providing for increased pensions to survivors of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

7070. By Mr. JOHNSON of Nebraska: Resolution from Court No. 1009, Catholic Daughters of America, protesting passage of House bill 10; to the Committee on Education.

7071. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition consisting of individual letters, registering protest against the Federal education bill, and contending that education is a local matter and not for governmental administration, from the following citizens of the third congressional district, Brooklyn, N. Y.: Harry F. Collins, John P. Cummings, Julie Cummings, Mrs. M. Garvey, Alice McCann, Rose McCann, Richard P. Murphy, and Michael J. Quinlan; to the Committee on Education.

7072. By Mr. OSIAS: Petition signed by Deogracias Mata, of Daraga, Albay, Philippine Islands, urging the passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2502; to the Committee on Pensions.

7073. By Mr. STONE: Resolution indorsing House bill 10574, signed by Mrs. C. R. Lawrence, president of the Cleveland County Women's Federated Farm Clubs; Mrs. Roger Lessly, secretary; and Mrs. Roy Klenlen, treasurer, all of Norman, Okla.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7074. By Mr. SWICK: Petition of Gen. George Crook Camp, No. 3, National Indian War Veterans, 2435 North Carlisle Street, Philadelphia, Pa., and 2,275 members of affiliated camps in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, New York, and Maryland, urging the enactment of House bill 8976 for the relief of veterans and widows and minor orphan children of veterans of Indian wars; to the Committee on Pensions.

7075. By Mr. THATCHER: Petition signed by William H. Lawson and others, of Jefferson County, Ky., supporting Spanish War veterans' legislation; to the Committee on Pensions.

7076. By Mr. WYANT: Petition of Mount Odlin Sisterhood, Dames of Malta, Greensburg, Pa., advocating passage of Robison-Capper free public school bill (H. R. 10); to the Committee on Education.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, April 23, 1930

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1930)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allen	Couzens	Hale	Keyes
Ashurst	Cutting	Harris	La Follette
Barkley	Dale	Harrison	McCulloch
Bingham	Deneen	Hatfield	McKellar
Black	Dill	Hawes	McNary
Blaine	Fess	Hayden	Norbeck
Blease	Frazier	Hebert	Norris
Borah	George	Heflin	Nye
Brock	Gillett	Howell	Oddie
Broussard	Glass	Johnson	Overman
Capper	Goldsborough	Jones	Patterson
Caraway	Gould	Kean	Phipps
Copeland	Greene	Kendrick	Pine

Pittman
Ransdell
Robinson, Ind.
Robson, Ky.
Shipstead
Shortridge
Simmons

Smoot
Steck
Steinwer
Stephens
Sullivan
Swanson
Thomas, Idaho

Thomas, Okla.
Townsend
Trammell
Vandenberg
Wagner
Walcott
Walsh, Mass.

Walsh, Mont.
Waterman
Watson
Wheeler

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I announce that the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] and the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] are absent attending the funeral services of the late Representative Lee, of Texas. They will probably be absent until Thursday.

I also wish to announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are all detained from the Senate by illness.

I further desire to announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] are returning from the London Naval Conference.

Mr. NORBECK. My colleague [Mr. McMASTER] is unavoidably absent from the city. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I wish to announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SCHALL] is unavoidably absent. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

INVESTIGATION OF SALE OF GOVERNMENT SHIPS

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I was astonished to find in the Record this morning that the resolution (S. Res. 129) seeking to investigate the sale of Government ships had been taken from the calendar yesterday in the presence of a handful of Senators and placed upon its passage. It was well known by all concerned that there was opposition in the committee to the proposal. I vigorously protest against bringing up matters in the Senate from the calendar, except as they may be purely local in character, without notice to other Senators of an intention to do so.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The resolution was brought up yesterday soon after the session began, when there were probably as many Senators present as are present now. The matter was discussed only casually. I remember that the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] stated that he would vote against it if it came to a vote, but would not object to its consideration, and I did not know there was any other objection.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator from Tennessee knows very well that the Senator from New York opposed the matter in the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; that is true.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator was present at the time.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. COPELAND. I think it is a very grave mistake to impose another investigation upon the country. Here is a matter relating to the Shipping Board. We have had investigations without end of that board. The matters brought up are matters which have been discussed on the floor of the Senate time and time again. In any event it was a matter in the consideration of which those of us who had other views had the right to be heard.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the resolution was agreed to may be reconsidered and the resolution restored to the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the reconsideration of the vote by which the resolution was agreed to?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall object.

Mr. COPELAND. I hereby enter a motion to reconsider the vote agreeing to the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion to reconsider will be entered.

PETITIONS

Mr. JONES presented petitions of sundry citizens of Seattle, Wash., praying for the passage of the so-called Smoot bill, being Senate bill 1468, to amend the food and drugs act of June 30, 1906, by extending its provisions to tobacco and tobacco products, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (S. 3950) authorizing the establishment of a migratory bird refuge in the Cheyenne Bot-